THE TEXT OF JEREMIAH.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, ... HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, ... GEORGE HERBERT.

NEW YORK, ... SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

TORONTO, ... METHODIST BOOK & PUBLISHING HOUSE.

LEIPZIG, ... J. C. HINRICHS'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG.

THE TEXT OF JEREMIAH;

OR,

A CRITICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE GREEK AND HEBREW, WITH THE VARIATIONS IN THE LXX. RETRANSLATED INTO THE ORIGINAL AND EXPLAINED.

BY THE

REV. GEORGE COULSON WORKMAN, M.A.,

PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS AND LITERATURE IN VICTORIA UNIVERSITY, COBOURG, ONT., CANADA.

WITH

An Introductory Notice

BY

PROFESSOR FRANZ DELITZSCH, D.D.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1889.

TO

MY VENERABLE AND VALUED FRIEND,

PROFESSOR FRANZ DELITZSCH, D.D.

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG,

IN ADMIRATION OF

HIS DEEP PIETY AND PROFOUND SCHOLARSHIP,

THIS BOOK IS DEDICATED

AS A TOKEN OF

GRATITUDE AND AFFECTION.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER VII.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHAPTER IX.

CHAPTER X.

CORRECTION.

Omit "bride" and "bridegroom," chap. vii. 34, on page 129, lines 15, 16 from the top.

PREFACE.

As intimated on the title-page, the present volume is an earnest attempt to solve the difficult problem of the variations between the Greek and Hebrew texts of Jeremiah. Besides discussing the condition and relation of the texts, and explaining the nature and origin of the divergences between them, I have endeavoured to deduce the fundamental principles of deviation, by the application of which the Septuagint translation reveals important matter, as well for the Hebrew grammar and the Hebrew lexicon, as for the history, the interpretation, the correction, and the reconstruction of the present Massoretic text.

Although the latter portion of the work has been prepared exclusively for scholars, the former and by far the larger portion of it has been prepared, as well for general as for special students of the Old Testament. It is intended to be used by all who have an interest in the critical condition of the Scripture text. For this reason, the entire discus-

sion has been written in such a style that any one, whether acquainted with Greek and Hebrew or not, may read it easily and intelligently. Having aimed throughout at plainness and perspicuity, I have purposely avoided, so far as practicable, the use of purely technical language, and have everywhere explained the terms and translated the words and expressions, which an ordinary English reader might not reasonably be expected to understand.

In trying to recover the original of the Septuagint by the process of retranslation, I have been encouraged by many competent judges to believe that the method I have adopted for exhibiting the deviations to the best advantage will be regarded as both convenient and important, inasmuch as it not only presents concisely a general view of the divergences in this book, but also indicates clearly how the same kind of service may be performed for the other books of Jewish Scripture. A very small amount of work has hitherto been done in this department. Without a guide, therefore, in a comparatively untrodden field, I have striven to beat out a path which other investigators may tread more confidently than I have dared, and more successfully, perhaps, than I have hoped, to tread myself.

Owing to the extent of this prophetic book, comprising, as it does, almost a twelfth part of the

whole Old Testament, the work has naturally cost a great expenditure of time and toil. After nearly three years and a half of patient and painstaking study, in connection with other absorbing and exacting duties, having been engaged at this inquiry since the summer of 1885, I am aware that it is still, in some respects, deficient as well as incomplete. Much more time might have been devoted advantageously to the investigation. A longer study would have enabled me more thoroughly to weigh difficult and doubtful words, more fully to discuss personal and proper names, and more copiously to illustrate generic and specific kinds of deviation.

Many important features of the Septuagint, moreover, have been briefly indicated in a paragraph or two that might have been abundantly exemplified by striking and convincing illustrations; but the want of time and the fear of making too large a volume have deterred me from multiplying examples. I have spared no pains, however, to make the work as thorough as its compass would permit. The results of my researches, therefore, are modestly submitted to Biblical scholars and students for careful and unprejudiced consideration, with the consciousness that, had more time and study been allowed, they might have been much more complete, but also with the conviction that,

inexhaustive as they are, they will be found to be a serviceable contribution to the science of Old Testament text-criticism.

Several distinguished scholars have desired to see the Septuagint text of Jeremiah entirely retranslated into Hebrew. Having often been advised by persons of experience to publish a complete and accurate retranslation of the book, as soon as an opportunity for investigating the Greek manuscripts may be afforded, I shall esteem it a great favour if practised critics, after an examination of the work, will have the kindness to give me any suggestions that may occur to them, particularly in the way of indicating imperfections, or of pointing out improvements.

While personally responsible for the views advanced, the positions maintained, and the conclusions reached throughout the whole discussion, I desire, in this place, to express my deep gratitude to all who have assisted me in any respect with the investigation. My grateful acknowledgments are especially due for kind advice and constant interest during the preparation of the work to Professor Franz Delitzsch, D.D., the eminent Old Testament commentator; for useful suggestions and valuable services in the process of retranslation to Dr. S. Mandelkern, the excellent Hebrew specialist; for careful and conscientious help in comparing the

Targum of Jonathan with the Septuagint translation, and in revising the manuscript of the variations for the press, to Dr. M. Chamizer, the able Literary Manager of the famous Oriental printing-house of W. Drugulin, Leipzig, where the last chapter of the work was composed and stereotyped.

Although the terms of notation or abbreviation employed throughout the last chapter are few and simple, yet it may be worth while giving, in this connection, a brief explanation of them. In the text, "Deest" indicates the absence from the Septuagint of the word or words standing opposite to it, and "Desunt," the absence from the same of the words or verses opposite to which it stands. In the footnotes, "Cf." refers to a similar reading, and "ut" to an identical reading, in the Hebrew; "Vid." refers to a similar or like rendering in the Greek; "Inc." denotes a different verse-division in the version; "Targ." stands for the Targum of Jonathan; "Alex." for the Alexandrian Codex, and "Aram." for Aramaic.

The volume is now given to the world with the hope that it may prove an interest-awakening and a science-furthering investigation. In so far as this discussion of one of the most complicated questions of Old Testament interpretation shall stimulate the spirit of Scriptural inquiry or help the progress of Biblical criticism, and thus promote the cause of

sacred truth of which the prophet Jeremiah was a powerful and uncompromising preacher, my reverent researches will be rewarded, and my earnest wishes realized.

G. C. WORKMAN.

LEIPZIG, *January* 1889.

INTRODUCTORY NOTICE

BY

PROFESSOR DELITZSCH.

THERE is no prophetic life and no prophetic book, of which so many details are known to us, as the life of Jeremiah and the collection of his prophecies. We know that this prophet twice dictated his prophecies to his amanuensis, Baruch, as Paul the Epistle to the Romans to Tertius; that king Jehoiakim burned one roll, and that Jeremiah then prepared a new and, according to chap. xxxvi. 32, a greatly enlarged edition, which, perhaps, was left unfinished, to be gradually completed. It was possibly concluded in Egypt either by the prophet himself or by his secretary, Baruch; but that we do not know. This, however, is certain, that the collection of prophecies, as it now stands before us, has not the form which it finally received from Jeremiah, or from his faithful servant. The original arrangement must have been another and a different one, because the present order of the component parts of the book amongst

themselves gives the impression of an arbitrary and a confused disarrangement. Besides, this later redaction or revision shows itself to be such by insertions from the book of the Kings. But even the form which the later redactor gave the collection is not perfectly preserved. Chap. xxvi. 17 was evidently not written by the redactor of the collection. It betrays itself at once as a later and a very misleading insertion. In chap. xl. 1, a divine revelation to Jeremiah is announced, but no such communication follows. It seems that here chaps. xxx., xxxi. have got out of their right place. The expression וְיָעֵפוּ ("and they shall be weary"), in chap. li. 64, is manifestly repeated from ver. 58. The historical piece, vers. 59–64, therefore, may originally have occupied another position in this prophetic book.

From what standpoint the prophet's last edition was arranged we do not know, but the singular disarrangement, by which the later redactor has destroyed the original arrangement, nevertheless, cannot be purely arbitrary or absolutely thoughtless. The considerations by which he was governed, or the principles by which he was guided, must certainly be penetrable. But, so far as I can survey the literature of the interpretation and explanation of the book, no one, as yet, has been successful in finding out the point of view from

which the later redactor has torn to pieces things which chronologically and essentially belong to each other, and has placed them together, as they now appear. J. J. Staehelin in his discussion of the arrangement of Jeremiah's prophecies divides the book into seven parts,[1] and Anton Scholz in his monograph on the relation between the Greek and Hebrew texts of Jeremiah divides it into six decades;[2] but neither in Staehelin's seven nor in Scholz's six divisions is a planned unity of contents perceptible. As for me, I flatter myself with the opinion, that I may have succeeded in discovering the views which influenced the redactor.

The collection of Jeremiah's prophecies, as it now lies before us, according to my opinion, falls into nine groups or books of which each three, in a certain sense, form a trilogy, and that, indeed, in the following manner:—**1.** The book of the time of Josiah, or of the calling and first preaching of the prophet, chaps. i.–vi. **2.** The book of the time of Jehoiakim, or the preaching at the gate of the Temple, in the cities of Judah (Anathoth), and in the streets of Jerusalem, especially concerning the idolatry of the people, chaps. vii.–xii. **3.** The book of the irrevocable curse, belonging to the

[1] *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, t. iii., 1849, p. 216.

[2] *Der masorethische Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung des Buches Jeremias*, 1875.

time of Jeconiah, chaps. xiii. – xx. Hereupon follow the three middle groups. **4.** The book against the shepherds of the people, without chronological arrangement, chaps. xxi. – xxv. **5.** The book of the conflict of Jeremiah with the false prophets, belonging partly to the time of Jehoiakim and partly to the first years of Zedekiah, chaps. xxvi. – xxix. Here along with Jeremiah, as true prophets, are mentioned the elder Micah and the contemporary Uriah; and, as false prophets, Hananiah, Ahab, Zedekiah, and Shemaiah, the warning against false prophets in chap. xxvii. constituting a keynote. **6.** The book of the restoration of Israel, without chronological arrangement, chaps. xxx.–xxxiii. The remaining three groups form the conclusion of the collection. **7.** The book of the accounts of the unbelief and scepticism of the kings and of the people of Israel, accounts belonging to the time of Jehoiakim, and encompassed by incidents of the time of Zedekiah, chaps. xxxiv.–xxxviii. **8.** The book of the destinies of the people after the destruction of Jerusalem, chaps. xxxix.–xlv., with the supplementary notice respecting Baruch, chap. xlv., standing in unchronological position. **9.** The book of the prophecies concerning the nations, a decade of oracles, beginning with Egypt and ending with Babylon, chaps. xlvi. – li., belonging partly to the time of

Jehoiakim, chaps. xl.–xlix. 33, and partly to the time of Zedekiah, chaps. xlix. 34–39; l.–li.

This is, as I think, the distribution aimed at by the redactor of our Hebrew text of Jeremiah. Such seem to me to have been the motives which impelled him to destroy the ancient order of the general contents of the book, and to substitute the present singular arrangement. I dare venture to hope that my results will bear examination. All kind of questions respecting the incorrect position, which many sections of the book appear to occupy, admit of a solution in this way. The outpouring of the intoxicating cup, chap. xxv., which is properly the exordium to book **9**, stands in book **4**, because the doom therein pronounced embraces all the shepherds (rulers) of the nations. The scourging of idolatry, chap. x. 1–16, stands in book **2**, because in that book the prophet's preaching is preëminently directed against the idol-worship of the people, chaps. vii. 18, 31; viii. 2. The section, which relates the conspiracy to take the prophet's life, because of his preaching against the Temple and the City, in the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign, chap. xxvi., although it belongs to the history of the prophetic discourse in chaps. vii.–xii., stands in book **5**, because it relates a part of Jeremiah's struggle with the priests, the prophets, and the princes. The history of the burning

of the first roll, chap. xxxvi., stands in book **7**, because it furnishes a proof of the unbelieving conduct of the Court toward the word of Jehovah and toward the person of his prophet. The consolatory prophecy for Baruch, chap. xlv., belonging to the fourth year of Jehoiakim, stands in book **8**, because it promises to Baruch deliverance from the fate of death after the destruction of Jerusalem; and the prophecies concerning the nations, chaps. xlvi.–li., constitute the last book, because they are appointed for the nations just as specially as chaps. i.–xliv., together with chap. xlv., are appointed for the people of Israel.

We possess, however, still another form of the collection, which differs conspicuously from that which it received from the hand of the Hebrew redactor. This is the Alexandrian form of the book, which deviates from the foregoing one not only in the arrangement, but also in the subject-matter, of the text. In the Septuagint, the prophecies concerning the nations occupy the middle of chap. xxv., vers. 1–13 forming a prologue, and vers. 15–38 forming an epilogue, to the whole group. These prophecies follow each other also in a quite divergent order. The prophecy respecting Elam, for instance, stands at the very beginning of the group in Greek, but almost at the very end of it in Hebrew. In the version, this nation, as it seems,

may have been threatened first, because of Alexander's recent military expedition. The Greek text, moreover, in all parts of the book, diverges frequently and remarkably from the Hebrew text, transmitted for ages before the time of Christ by Palestinean and Babylonian tradition, attested during the early centuries of the Christian era by the Massorites, and handed down in its present form from them to us.

In the accompanying work, my Canadian friend, Professor G. C. Workman, M.A., has undertaken the task of ascertaining, as far as practicable, the ancient Hebrew text which lay before the Greek translator, and which often seems to him to merit the preference over the present Massoretic text. The undertaking is a very interesting and important one. I fully concur with him in the opinion that the original of the Septuagint was, in many respects, a different text from that attested and established by the Massorites. I am utterly opposed to the view of Wichelhaus (1847) and others, who attribute to the Septuagint no critical value whatever. Although in places the Greek translator has made mistakes, owing to a combination of causes, as the following discussion shows, nevertheless, I consider that the Alexandrian version unquestionably presents a special textual arrangement, or represents, in short, a special text-

recension. I also regard the version as of very great importance for the history and the criticism of the Old Testament text.

The present investigation transports the question respecting the nature and origin of the variations in the prophecy of Jeremiah to an entirely new stage, inasmuch, especially, as it presents a complete and comprehensive view of the differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts in a way in which it hitherto has never been presented. The author thereby contributes to the science of Biblical criticism a work of valuable and lasting service. This production of my friend is the fruit of several years of indefatigable labour; and, if he sometimes thinks too favourably of the Septuagint translator, this is only the result of the loving devotion with which he has absorbed himself in the study of the Alexandrian text.

FRANZ DELITZSCH.

LEIPZIG, *December* 1888.

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS.

A CRITICAL investigation of any Old Testament writing involves particularly a fourfold inquiry. It embraces a thorough discussion of the character and condition of the present Hebrew or Massoretic text, and a careful consideration of the nature and importance of the other textual authorities. Of the latter there are principally four, namely, the Aramaic, the Syriac, the Latin, and the Greek translations. Each of these possesses some significance, and furnishes some materials for the lower or textual criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures; but the Greek translation, commonly called the Septuagint, or the Alexandrian version, is universally regarded as by far the most important of them all. Because of its age and influence, scholars in general are agreed that the Septuagint translation constitutes the principal aid for the Biblical critic in the textual work of the Old Testament. Hence the need of determining, as nearly as possible, its true nature and its real worth.

In undertaking to investigate the text of Jeremiah by the help of the Septuagint, one is con-

fronted at the outset with the character of the deviations in the version. The differences between the Greek and Hebrew are so numerous and so striking, that the question of their origin challenges immediate attention. The first thing necessary, therefore, in commencing a comparative study of the two texts, is an honest endeavour to solve the problem of the divergences between them. Not till this has been accomplished, can the Septuagint be safely or intelligently employed in the textual criticism of this prophetic book. Before attempting a solution of the problem, it will be expedient to explain the plan proposed in the present inquiry for this purpose.

In order the more completely to exhibit the character of the version, as well as the more clearly to account for its deviations, the method here adopted is that of retranslation; that is, of translating the Greek back again into Hebrew. By this means it can be shown, substantially at least, just what sort of text the original Hebrew manuscript of the Alexandrian version must have been. By this means, too, the nature and origin of the variations, it is believed, can be most readily demonstrated, the differences between the Greek and Hebrew most easily appreciated, and the importance of the Septuagint for purposes of text-criticism most accurately estimated.

In the complete Conspectus of the variations at the end of the work, the divergences are arranged in parallel columns, the divergent words, or letters

only, so far as practicable, being punctuated. In this way the differences between the two texts become manifest at once. The right-hand column contains the deviations from the Greek in the Hebrew; the left-hand column contains the deviations from the Hebrew in the Greek, retranslated into Hebrew. If the words in the latter be systematically substituted for those in the former, and carefully inserted where they logically belong in the present Massoretic text, the original of the version may be promptly and approximately obtained. This method has the advantage of giving a concise and comprehensive view of the variations without repeating subject-matter common to each text alike, except in so far as such a repetition is necessary in order to display the variations clearly and conspicuously.

An important rule observed in retranslating, it should be stated, is that of endeavouring to explain the minor variations by means of similar Hebrew letters. Wherever there seemed to be the slightest reason for believing that the original of the one text was substantially, if not identically, the same as the original of the other, an effort has been made to find a resembling substitute. The constant observance of this rule has been most advantageous in discovering the various principles of divergency deduced and illustrated in the accompanying discussion. But for its systematic application, several fundamental illustrations could scarcely have been ascertained. As the arrangement of the Greek

words follows almost slavishly the Hebrew order, even to the reproduction of the smallest particles and the most peculiar idioms, the intensely literal character of the Septuagint translation has helped materially in applying this simple but extremely essential rule.

Notwithstanding the extreme literalness of the translation, however, it is often difficult to tell whether an apparent deviation in the version represents a real deviation in the original manuscript. For this reason, many doubtful words in Greek are indicated in connection with the Conspectus of the variations. Sometimes, too, it is difficult to determine whether or not a peculiar Greek expression represents a variant Hebrew reading; and, if it does, it is practically impossible to tell how it should be retranslated. One example out of several that might be given is found in chap. xlix. 16, where the combination *ἡ παιγνία σου ἐνεχείρησέ σοι*, stands for תִּפְלַצְתְּךָ הִשִּׁיא אֹתָךְ ("thy terribleness hath deceived thee"). The Hebrew word translated "terribleness" does not elsewhere occur throughout the Bible, and its exact signification here is exceedingly obscure. In all such cases of obscurity, Hebrew scholars will be able to appreciate the great perplexity experienced very frequently in the work of retranslation.

As in the English, so also in the Alexandrian, version, the same expression, even in a similar connection, is not uniformly translated. This want of uniformity greatly increases the difficulty of

retranslation, because the same word, or the same combination of words, is differently rendered by different translators in different books, as well as in different parts of the same book. Although in general this book is characterized by great consistency in the use of many specific terms, yet sufficient irregularity appears in certain portions of it to justify the supposition that several persons were employed in making the Greek version. For these reasons, as doubt was frequently inevitable and certainty sometimes impracticable, the retranslation of very many words and phrases must be regarded as tentative, and not in any sense as final. In all such instances of uncertainty, other investigators might give another and, perhaps, a happier rendering of the Greek.

Even in passages where a special textual arrangement in the version is unquestionable, it is by no means easy always to determine which expression should be used in retranslating from the Greek, since one must choose between two and three and sometimes four synonymous Hebrew words. As the choice requires the exercise of both taste and skill, alternatives have often been presented for the consideration of those experienced in this kind of criticism. In the case of a word of rare or single occurrence, it is practically, if not absolutely, impossible to decide with certainty. A simple example of perplexity occurs in the opening sentence of the book, which, in the Septuagint, reads, *Τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ὃ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Ἱερεμίαν.* In this superscription,

which forms a common introduction to the prophetic books, as may be seen by reference to Hosea, Joel, Micah, Zephaniah, and which reproduces an original Hebrew text, as every competent critic will perceive, it is quite uncertain whether the expression *Τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ Θεοῦ* should be rendered דְּבַר־יְהוָֹה (the word of Jehovah) or דְּבַר־אֱלֹהִים (the word of God). Inasmuch as the latter, so far as has been ascertained, nowhere else occurs in such a superscription, the former has been given in the Conspectus of the variations. The Alexandrian introduction, though, may be translated, "The word of God (or, the word Jehovah) which was to Jeremiah."

When quoting from the English Bible, it will be seen, the Revised Version, except in a few cases of verbal translation, has always been used; but, when translating from the Septuagint, it will be observed, a literal rendering of the Greek text has invariably been given. The Greek word *κύριος*, which generally represents the Hebrew word יְהוָֹה, has been regularly translated by the English word "Jehovah." The term in Hebrew is not a divine title, but a divine name, and, therefore, should be literally reproduced. Not only is "Jehovah" a tolerably accurate, though very debatable, reproduction in English of the present Hebrew word, but also it is an euphonious word which has long become naturalized in the language. This pronunciation of this name of the Deity, moreover, has been in circulation, more or less

extensively, since the sixteenth century, at least. For these reasons, it seems to be quite expedient to retain the common form of the old English word.

By way of distinguishing the Hebrew phrase אָמַר יְהוָה ("says Jehovah") from נְאֻם־יְהוָה ("a declaration of Jehovah"), which throughout this book is usually represented by the Greek λέγει κύριος or εἶπε κύριος, the latter Hebrew phrase has been regularly translated by "declares Jehovah." The word נְאֻם, which is a passive participle in the construct state used as a substantive, is so uniformly rendered in the Septuagint as a verb that it may, perhaps, have been so considered by the Greek translators, who render it as though it was formerly pronounced נָאַם, and employed as an emphatic synonym for אָמַר. Whether probable or not, the supposition is here suggested as being possible, at least. The words in Hebrew are not identical, as the rendering of them in the English versions might seem to ordinary readers to imply, and there appears to be a great propriety in observing the true distinction between them, when giving an exact translation of them.

The Greek text used throughout the present work is that of Tischendorf, this having been esteemed the best edition of the Septuagint available at the time that the investigation was commenced. The Hebrew text employed is Hahn's edition of van der Hooght. When citing Hebrew words, the Massoretic pointing has generally been

reproduced, wherever a point of punctuation or of accentuation might be regarded as really essential; but wherever such a point might be regarded as purely euphonic, its reproduction has not always been observed. This remark, of course, applies to the use of the signs for aspirate-letters and tone-syllables. It should be noted further that in exhibiting the different kinds or classes of variation, several examples have been once or twice repeated, because the same example sometimes illustrates two and three different species of divergency.

The last chapter of the work, which comprises the Conspectus of the variations, is so arranged as to constitute a kind of critical apparatus, by means of which Biblical critics may examine the full results of the investigation in detail, and by the use of which they may apply the different principles of variation to the textual criticism of the other Hebrew Scriptures. The footnotes in this chapter contain references to parallel passages and analogous constructions, both in this book and in other books of the Old Testament; citations from the Targum, when it either agrees with or corresponds to the Septuagint translation; doubtful and peculiar words and phrases in the Greek, which seem to possess a special interest; a few readings from the Alexandrian manuscript, which appear to be of some importance; and an occasional Aramaic word, which suggests the possible origin of a deviation in the version.

In discussing the character and condition of the present Hebrew text, an endeavour has been made, first to ascertain the facts, and then to let these speak for themselves. Indeed, throughout the whole investigation the scientific or comparative method has been employed. This method has already been successfully applied to physical and to philological science, and it may be as properly, if not as fruitfully, applied to Biblical as to any other science. All true theories must be formed from facts, tested with facts, and established by facts. Sweeping generalizations from insufficient data, or from superficial knowledge of them, are utterly valueless. Only by collecting all the evidence available can sound principles be deduced or safe inferences drawn.

From copious internal evidence it must with disappointment be admitted that the character of the Massoretic text of Jeremiah is deplorably unsatisfactory. This text is both imperfect and defective. Its imperfections have long been recognized by most impartial critics, and its defects are now acknowledged by every competent scholar. The question of its absolute integrity or infallibility is no longer a matter of debate. Difficulties and obscurities abound all through the book. As the Hebrew stands at present, it is often hard either to give a tolerable translation of it, or to obtain an intelligible meaning from it. Of many passages more than one rendering is fairly possible; and of many other passages an

adequate rendering or interpretation is practically impossible.

From ample external evidence, moreover, the condition of the Hebrew text is also exceedingly unsatisfactory. It can be proved conclusively to have suffered not only from corruption, but also from alteration. In many ways and at different times it has unquestionably undergone considerable change. Apart from manifest alterations, transpositions, interpolations and revisions, the independent testimony of each ancient version, especially of the Septuagint translation, establishes this fact beyond a doubt. A critical comparison of the Greek and Hebrew shows clearly that the latter text has been extensively and systematically modified. Such a comparison further shows that the ancient manuscript, from which the original of the Massoretic text was taken, differed essentially from that now known to us, as well as materially from that known to the makers of the Alexandrian version.

It has been commonly supposed that the chief sources of textual divergency between the Greek and Hebrew were either the caprice and ignorance of translators, or the carelessness and indifference of copyists. For this reason, the variations have been hitherto attributed, partly to accident but principally to design. The supposition seems both unreasonable and incredible. Such surprising deviations as occur throughout the version must have had a worthy origin. If the Alexandrian translators were authoritatively employed to make

a version of the Hebrew Scriptures, as has been generally held, it is natural to suppose that they were properly qualified for their duties, as well as reasonable to believe that they honestly performed their work. Assuming in this investigation the efficiency and integrity of the Greek translators, the facts collected and the principles deduced demonstrate the hypothesis of a special text, or text-recension, as it is technically termed, from which the Septuagint translation was originally made. No other explanation of the divergences, it can be shown, is either adequate or admissible.

Since, in several other Old Testament books, the Greek text differs greatly from the Hebrew text, it may be asked, as Graf, for instance, asks, Why should the hypothesis of a special text-recension be assumed simply for this book, and not for those other books in which divergences abound? In reply, it may be stated that the variations in the present book are exceptionally numerous and significant, and that their number, as well as their nature, establishes the truth of the hypothesis respecting their origin. The same hypothesis, though, it may be added, seems to be just as probable in reference to Daniel, Esther, Job, and Proverbs, as in reference to Jeremiah. Only on this assumption can the variations in each of these books be satisfactorily explained. Indeed, the same hypothesis possibly may, and probably does, apply to each book of the Old Testament.

The theory of different text-recensions of the

ancient Jewish Scriptures is rapidly and rationally finding favour. In their Preface to the Revised Version of the Hebrew Bible, the English translators openly acknowledge its reasonableness and probability. "The Received or, as it is commonly called, the Massoretic text of the Old Testament Scriptures," they say, "has come down to us in manuscripts which are of no very great antiquity, and which all belong to the same family or recension. That other recensions were at one time in existence is probable from the variations in the Ancient Versions, the oldest of which, namely the Greek or Septuagint, was made, at least in part, some two centuries before the Christian era."

This assertion of the Revisers is exceedingly important, inasmuch as an unreasonable prejudice against such an assumption has hitherto prevailed. There has been a great reluctance, on the part of Christian scholars in the past, to acknowledge that the Septuagint translators could have used a Hebrew text different from that which the Massorites employed. The proofs, though, are so overwhelming that the conclusion is inevitable. That there were certainly two recensions of the book of Jeremiah, at the time of its translation into Greek, when all the facts are considered, and when all the evidence is weighed, cannot be reasonably doubted. That this was possibly the case respecting many, if not all, of the other books of the Old Testament may be just as reasonably believed. The ancient circumstances of the Jewish people and the early

condition of their sacred writings render the supposition not simply possible but probable.

During the present investigation, the thought has often been suggested that, instead of two, there may have once been several recensions of certain books, at least. Just how many it is useless to conjecture. There appear to have been Scripture rolls for public services, for official purposes, and for private use. Different distinguished individuals, as well as families, may have possessed a copy. The probability of this suggestion, which partially explains how variations might gradually and naturally arise, is strengthened by the statement of a recent writer in an able article on the Revised Version of the Old Testament. Speaking of the ancient documents and rolls, of which the existing Hebrew manuscripts present a later revision of the sacred text, which has restored to it the greater purity in which it now appears in contrast to the versions, he asserts, "We are expressly informed that there were standard copies kept in the Temple, perhaps also in some synagogues. This would not exclude, rather it seems to imply, the existence of diverging readings in manuscripts belonging to families or individuals."[1]

In considering the nature of the Septuagint, the purpose has been, so far as possible, to let the translation tell its own story. An unprejudiced examination of the Greek text shows the groundlessness of the charge of arbitrariness generally

[1] *Edinburgh Review*, October, 1885, p. 460.

brought against the Alexandrian translators, and the inadequacy of the opinion popularly entertained respecting the character of their work. That they sometimes made mistakes, considering the circumstances of their time, was natural. With all their practised skill, the Massorites have also made mistakes. That they sometimes translated conjecturally, considering the condition of their manuscript, was inevitable. Rather than change the sacred text, modern translators have also done the same. In rendering obscurely written parchment rolls no other course could be pursued. The very mistakes and imperfections of the version, most of which can be with almost scientific certainty explained, attest the genuine integrity of the Greek translators and the exceeding conscientiousness with which their arduous labours were performed.

When indicating the importance of the Septuagint, no undue excellence has been intentionally claimed for it. If a preference for its general textual arrangement has been emphatically expressed, this has been because it really appears to possess the preference in this respect. Only a few of its more striking features of superiority have been pointed out. Beautiful illustrations of superior reading might have been many times increased, but space forbade the multiplying of examples. A sufficient number has been given, though, to indicate that the critical value of the version can scarcely be too highly estimated. An impartial consideration of

its character proves that for the emendation of the Massoretic text, an entire reconstruction of which the English Revisers have suggested but have not attempted, the Septuagint translation claims the foremost place as the chief corrective instrument in the textual criticism of this prophetic book.

The absence of a critical edition of the Septuagint has been urged as an excuse for not attempting by its help to reconstruct the present Hebrew text. Some scholars, believing that the Greek text is in a very different state from that in which it left the hands of the Alexandrian translators, propose to postpone the use of it altogether as a critical aid till after it has been restored, so far as possible, to its original form. Just how much reason there may be for holding that the Septuagint has suffered seriously by transmission is a question that must be left for settlement to those who have the time and opportunity to investigate it. It is evident, of course, that before the full value of the version can be clearly evinced, the Greek text itself must first be thoroughly investigated. Only when this has been accomplished can perfectly satisfactory work with it be performed. Sometimes one of the other manuscripts, it has been noticed in the process of retranslation, presents a more probable reading than that presented by the Vatican manuscript used by Tischendorf. But, notwithstanding the uncritical condition of the Septuagint, this investigation shows that even in its present state it

furnishes valuable textual materials, and reveals important critical results.

Inasmuch as this book has existed in a twofold form for upwards of two thousand years, at least, and inasmuch as its ancient form has been considerably modified, it is now impossible to ascertain with certainty the exact shape which it may have received either from the prophet Jeremiah or from his secretary, Baruch. That is, its absolutely original form can never be discovered, because of the manifold textual changes that were made in it during the centuries that intervened between the period of its composition and the time of its establishment by the Massorites. In so far, however, as the present Greek text can be relied upon, as representing a trustworthy text of the date of its translation, it brings us many centuries nearer to the materials with which to work in reconstructing the sacred text. In endeavouring to recover the original of the version by the method of re-translation, the relation between the Greek and Hebrew will be made more manifest, and the relative age and purity of each text will become more clear.

The ancient Hebrew or Aramaic manuscript from which the Septuagint was translated belonged to the third century before Christ, whereas the oldest Hebrew manuscript of which the age is definitely known belongs to the tenth century after Christ. If, therefore, the original of the Greek text was a good one, as it most probably was, and, if the work

of translation was well done, as it most certainly seems to have been, then, so far as the original text of the Septuagint can be regained, we have a text of Jeremiah in a recension four or five hundred years older than the text attested and established by the Massorites, and twelve or thirteen hundred years older than the earliest Hebrew manuscript at present in existence. The original of the Septuagint unquestionably represented much more nearly the original form of the book than the existing Hebrew represents it. For this reason, its careful reproduction, so far as practicable, becomes a matter of the utmost possible importance.

Up to the present time, the Massoretic text has generally been taken by modern translators as the groundwork of Old Testament criticism, because it has been commonly supposed to furnish the best attested text of the Jewish Scriptures. In some respects, it is undoubtedly entitled to special consideration; but it possesses no such exceptional claim to authority as to entitle it to infallibility. On the contrary, it is now known and acknowledged to be fallible and imperfect in many places and in many ways. Since the publication of the Revised Version especially, the question of its absolute trustworthiness has come into prominence as never before. The judgment, though, of Christian scholars differs greatly as to how far the supremacy should be given to it. While the English Revisers have made the Massoretic text the basis of their work, they have frequently departed from it, having

quite often, in an instance of extreme difficulty, adopted a reading on the authority of the ancient versions, which is always inserted in the margin, but never incorporated with the text. The American Revisers, on the other hand, have refused even this reference to secondary sources, as they regard the versions, and have suggested the omission from the margin of all renderings from the Septuagint and other textual authorities.

Although the Hebrew has ever been the received text in the Protestant Church, yet a portion of Christendom has always adhered to the authority of the Greek ; and, "for a long period, the Septuagint was the Old Testament of the far larger part of the Christian Church."[1] Hence both its age and history entitle it to the profoundest consideration. The opinion, there is a reason to believe, is gradually gaining ground that hitherto enough importance has not generally been attached to this ancient version, and that due attention has not generally been given to its testimony. Whatever may be shown to be its value in reference to the other books, its value for the textual criticism of this book is inestimable. Its critical significance for the text of Jeremiah points to the conclusion, not only that it should be constantly consulted, but also that it should be carefully compared, in investigating the text of every Old Testament writing. In comparing the Hebrew with the Greek throughout each book certain inquiries

[1] Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii., p. 1204.

should be made. Firstly, do the two texts agree? Secondly, if they disagree, were their originals similar or different? Thirdly, if similar, by what principle can the variations be explained? Fourthly, if different, which text exhibits the more primitive or more probable rendering? The answers to these questions, it is thought, can be most easily obtained by turning the Greek back into Hebrew again.

Because, as has been mentioned, the present Massoretic text rests upon documents of no very great antiquity, documents which are supposed to represent a single prototype of the time of the Emperor Hadrian, several distinguished scholars, like Lagarde and his disciples, find in the Alexandrian version the leading or controlling factor for the restoration of the Old Testament text to its original purity. The textual supremacy of the Septuagint is vigorously maintained and, perhaps, justly claimed by this school of critics, on the ground of the significantly greater age of its Hebrew or Aramaic original. Thus far, this principle of giving the precedence to the Septuagint has only been partially applied by Wellhausen to the books of Samuel, and thoroughly applied by Cornill to the book of Ezekiel, the latter scholar having, by this method, entirely and even radically reconstructed the Ezekiel text. If the Greek translation of Jeremiah really bears the relation which it seems to bear to the original form of this book, then it should not simply be consulted in correcting and emending the present Hebrew, but, when its text

has been restored, it should itself be made the basis of reconstruction.

Thus a critical and impartial consideration of the character and condition of the Massoretic text of Jeremiah, and also of the nature and importance of the Septuagint translation of it, will prove conclusively, it is believed, that the popular notions that prevail respecting each text are entirely incorrect. In the past, too much dependence has been placed upon Massoretic teaching and tradition. The more carefully the true relation between the Greek and Hebrew is investigated, the more clearly it will appear that most of the traditional views of this, as well as of every other, book of Jewish Scripture have been the outcome both of prejudice and of prepossession. Whether they have been more largely due to the one than to the other cause, or whether they have been equally due to each, it is useless to discuss, because it is impossible to determine. At all events, they have resulted from an exercise of criticism which only a predilection for a preconceived opinion could produce.

Earnest Christian scholars are now labouring to find a better text of the Old Testament. In their inquiries and discussions, the central and essential question is the comparative worth or excellence of the Greek and Hebrew texts. On whichever side the final verdict may fall, after the fullest and deepest researches have been made, the proved results of Biblical criticism must neither be discarded nor discredited. Both on philological and

theological grounds, Biblical science requires a prudent application to all the books of Scripture of the most improved as well as of the most approved methods of textual criticism. A perfect text of the Old Testament is unattainable at present, and may not be attainable in future; but a more perfect one than we now possess may easily be attained. Towards its attainment the interests of truth demand the employment of every aid available and the use of every means accessible. "For," as Canon Cheyne says, "the true spiritual meaning of the Scriptures can only be reached through the door of the letter; and the nearer we approach to a correct reading of the text, the more vivid will be our apprehension of the sacred truths which it conveys."[1]

It is not now denied, and it should no longer be concealed, that the received text of the Old Testament is both faulty and defective. There is no use of saying respecting it, "Peace, peace; when there is no peace." It is worse than useless to make claims for Scripture, or for Scripture text, that cannot be maintained. What is needed is a sober knowledge of the true state of the case. By all efforts, we should seek to ascertain the facts; and, at all hazards, we should strive to let the facts be known. The truth must be sought at any cost, and it must not be sold at any price. The truth, moreover, has nothing to fear, but everything to hope, from critical investigation. "We can do

[1] *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, vol. ii., third edition, p. 240.

nothing," Paul declares, "against the truth, but for the truth." Reverent textual criticism, however keen or searching, can only lead to the adoption of sounder principles, and to the employment of correcter methods, in the discovery and elucidation of the truth. Every judicious Christian teacher, therefore, should proclaim, as the venerable Delitzsch, in the Introduction to his new and valuable commentary on the book of Genesis, with weighty words of golden worth, significantly proclaims, "God is the God of truth; love of truth, yielding to the constraint of truth, giving up the traditional views, which cannot stand the test of truth, is a sacred duty, a part of the fear of God.'

THE TEXT OF JEREMIAH.

CHAPTER I.

THE RELATION OF THE VERSION.

THE relation of the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament to the present Hebrew text is an interesting subject of investigation which has been too little regarded in the past. For this reason, the true value of the Alexandrian version for purposes of text-criticism has been either greatly underestimated or largely overlooked. Although, of late years, considerable discussion amongst distinguished scholars has taken place upon the nature and significance of this ancient textual authority, the question is only just beginning to receive that measure of attention which its importance properly deserves. Very divergent views have been advanced, and very opposite opinions still prevail, respecting its real critical worth for the interpretation and correction of the so-called Massoretic text of the Old Testament.

In general, the Greek and Hebrew renderings of the Jewish Scriptures pretty closely correspond. There are, however, notable exceptions to this rule. The Books of Jeremiah, Proverbs, Job, Esther, and Daniel exhibit remarkable irregularities. In the first-named book especially, the dissimilarity of the readings is prodigious. A casual comparison of the texts in question discovers singular discrepancies, such as changes in the position of the chapters, in the order of the prophecies, and in the arrangement of the general contents of the book. A closer investigation reveals divergences of a much more serious sort, such as modifications of statements and expressions, and transpositions of words and verses. A minute examination discloses the absence from the Greek of an enormous amount of matter belonging to the Hebrew, the presence in the former of very many words and phrases wanting in the latter, and the existence in both Greek and Hebrew of a great variety of minor differences of more or less significance. So numerous altogether are the variations, and so startling in many places is their character, that it has sometimes been a question in the minds of earnest critics which of these texts is the more authoritative, or which one ought to be adopted in translating this ancient book of prophecy into a modern tongue.

From authentic sources, these divergences are

proved to have existed at a very early date. Reference was made to them by Origen and Jerome, each of whom commented on the character of the Alexandrian version in his day. The former, after referring to the numerous variations in the Book of Job, describes the relation of the Greek and Hebrew to each other in the present book as follows:—"We have observed many such things also in Jeremiah, in which we found much transposition and alteration of the reading in the prophecies."[1] The latter, in discussing the differences between the two texts, scarcely more than mentions the general character of the deviations in the Greek. Neither of these early Christian Fathers attempted seriously to explain them, although the latter was disposed to attribute them chiefly to the carelessness of copyists.

Not simply are the divergences thus proved to be very old, but their extreme age indicates that most of them quite probably belonged to the Septuagint translation at the time that it was made. Hence many Hebrew scholars have concluded that the Greek translators used a much conciser copy of this book than that now represented by the Massoretic text. As Jeremiah spent

[1] *πολλὰ δὲ τοιαῦτα καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἱερεμίᾳ κατενοήσαμεν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πολλὴν μετάθεσιν καὶ ἐναλλαγὴν τῆς λέξεως τῶν προφητευομένων εὕρομεν.* *Epistola ad Africanum*, tomus xvii., p. 25; Lommatzsch edition.

the evening of his life in Northern Egypt, and as he may have ended there, as well his prophecies as his career, it has been naturally suggested that an earlier and a more authentic edition of the prophet's writings was in use amongst the Jews of Alexandria than amongst the Jews of Palestine and Babylonia. The likelihood of this suggestion, which does not appear to be unreasonable, has been much disputed, and the subject still remains a matter of debate. In this investigation, the question will be carefully considered in the clear light of the only hypothesis that consistently accounts for all the variations in this prophetic book.

In modern times three general opinions have prevailed respecting the comparative excellence of the Greek and the Hebrew text of this particular book. Some scholars have thought the former quite superior to the latter; others, while giving precedence to the latter, have placed both texts, in general, upon pretty nearly the same level; others again have thought the latter not merely preferable to the former, but alone authoritative in presenting Jeremiah's words. Of those who have claimed superiority for the Greek, the principal are J. D. Michaelis, Movers and de Wette, Hitzig, Bleek and Scholz. Of those who have regarded the Hebrew as exhibiting, on the whole, the better readings, but the Greek, in spite of many supposed

errors of translation, as approaching much more nearly that which one might reasonably expect the original Hebrew to have been, Ewald, Schrader, and Kuenen are the most distinguished. Of those who have considered the Hebrew incomparably superior to the Greek, the most prominent are Eichhorn, Rosenmüller and Spohn, Kueper, Hävernick and Wichelhaus, Nägelsbach and Hengstenberg, Keil, Graf and Orelli. These are particularly decided in pronouncing for the integrity of the Massoretic text. They one and all attribute only inferiority and uncertainty to the Septuagint translation. Indeed, the most interpreters in Europe and America, especially since the labours of Graf, have looked upon the Alexandrian version as totally untrustworthy, and as critically valueless.

Not only do modern opinions greatly differ as to the respective values of the texts in question, but also they widely differ as to the true origin of the manifold divergences between them. Several reasons for the variations have been assigned. They have been ascribed to carelessness, to ignorance, to haste, to design, and to different text-recensions. Some of these theories are the outcome of an almost superstitious veneration for the Massoretic text. They have arisen from a powerful and prevalent persuasion that the Hebrew text alone represented the ancient and original form of

the book, and that no other version or recension could, by any possibility, be correct. Without such a prejudice or prepossession, it is practically inconceivable either why or how the first four theories should have ever been suggested. Hitherto almost any explanation of the variations has been commonly considered more credible than the supposition that the Hebrew was not absolutely worthy of implicit confidence. In this connection these hypotheses require to be more fully stated. Each one of them does not call for an extended treatment, but each one claims, at least, a brief discussion and consideration.

The first hypothesis was proposed about the beginning of the fifth century of our era, by Jerome, and was adopted in the present century by Grabe. These have both attributed the variations to the carelessness of copyists. Divergences were, doubtless, sometimes due to such a cause; but errors by transcribers have not been restricted to the Septuagint. They belong as truly and, perhaps, as frequently to the Hebrew as to the Greek. Guilty, though, as copyists often are in this respect, it is impossible to account for many, much less for most, of the discrepancies on this hypothesis. Though some words had been overlooked, or added to the text, or even wrongly copied, by a transcriber, such mistakes, at least the great

majority of them, must have been discovered and corrected on revision. In such a standard copy of the Jewish Scriptures as the Septuagint was for many centuries, as it is, indeed, and always has been, in the Eastern Catholic Church, it is incredible that a prodigious number of transcriber's errors (the divergences amount to many thousand in this book alone) should have escaped detection and correction.

The second hypothesis has been adopted at different times by a few interpreters, who have held that very many of the variations were due to want of understanding on the part of the translator. Even Hitzig, Graf, and Umbreit have endeavoured to account for a considerable number of so-called abridgments and omissions by ascribing them to ignorance. This hypothesis is both unworthy and inadequate. It neither comports with the probabilities nor explains the great majority of the divergences. The translator must have had the fullest qualifications for his arduous undertaking. Without the necessary scholarship he would surely not have been selected for his sacred and important task. From the nature of his office and the character of his work, he must have been considered altogether competent by those responsible for his dignified appointment. A devout and cultured Jew, living at the height

of Alexandrian learning, trained in all the wisdom of the schools of that distinguished age, he, doubtless, was an efficient scholar, both in Hebrew and in Greek. Of his competency his translation, where his Hebrew text was not corrupt, or in some respect imperfect, affords the clearest and the most convincing proof, as will later on be fully shown, it is believed.

The third hypothesis has been suggested by Dean R. Payne Smith.[1] He supposes that the discrepancy between the texts was chiefly due to haste in the transcription of the Hebrew original of the Septuagint. During the period of his captivity in Egypt, either before or after Jeremiah's death, the prophet's secretary, Baruch, it is thought, may have employed a number of persons to prepare, as speedily as possible, perhaps on separate parchment rolls, a copy of this book of prophecy, which he desired to take back with him into Palestine. Were it only probable, a number of omissions might be easily explained on this hypothesis. It does not appear, however, to possess the slightest probability. As many of Jeremiah's prophecies had been delivered before the prophet left his native land, and had been for some time in his secretary's possession, Baruch had no need to have a special copy of them made. Moreover, apart from a large

[1] *Speaker's Commentary*, vol. v., pp. 324, 325.

proportion of the omissions for which it absolutely fails to account, the hypothesis altogether overlooks the numerous additions to the Septuagint, as well as the other kinds of deviation which continually occur throughout the book. This conjecture, therefore, must be looked upon as worthless, so far as furnishing a solution of the problem is concerned.

The fourth hypothesis has been maintained by Kueper and Hävernick, Spohn and Nägelsbach, Wichelhaus, Keil and Graf. These scholars, together with the great majority of recent expositors, ascribe the variations almost entirely to design. By them the Alexandrian version is considered a corrupt translation of the present Hebrew text. According to their hypothesis, the differences of rendering arose, partly from the arbitrariness and fickleness of the translator, and partly from the caprice and negligence of the transcribers, especially the later copyists. An unprejudiced consideration of the phenomena presented by a careful investigation of the two texts shows this hypothesis to be untrue. The variations are of such extent and character that they cannot have proceeded from either of the causes indicated, or from both of them combined. The very nature of the Septuagint itself disproves the theory. The Greek translation of this book in general, and of large portions of it

in particular, reproduces the Hebrew text, where there is reason to believe that the original of each text was formerly the same, with such literalness and fidelity, that it is utterly incredible that a translator or transcriber should have made such arbitrary and prodigious changes, as more or less abound in nearly every section of the work. It is only reasonable to assume that the Alexandrian version must have essentially agreed with the ancient Hebrew manuscript from which it was translated.

The fifth hypothesis was first proposed by Eichhorn. He suggested that the translator of the Septuagint used a Hebrew text which differed, as the variations indicate, from the traditional Massoretic text. He also believed that Jeremiah himself authorized various versions of his prophecies during his own lifetime. As the book is extant in a twofold form, both in respect to matter and arrangement, the hypothesis of different text-recensions, two at least, has been adopted and defended by Bertholdt, Michaelis, Movers, and Bleek. A Palestinean recension is supposed to have formed the original of the present Hebrew text, and an Alexandrian recension the original of the Septuagint translation. These two recensions, it is thought, must have been in circulation, the one in Asia, the other in Egypt, from some remote

but unknown period in the past. Whether, from the time this book became incorporated with the other prophetic books by Ezra or Nehemiah, it always had in Palestine and Babylonia the form in which it now appears in Hebrew, as Movers and Bleek believe, is questionable, but that the original manuscript from which the Septuagint was translated was not the same as the existing Hebrew text is unquestionable. The truth of this assertion can be fully demonstrated.

The general character of the variations has often been discussed by modern scholars, their approximate number indicated, and their distinctive features more or less completely pointed out. They have received, perhaps, the fullest treatment from the pen of Dr. Anton Scholz.[1] He has given a tolerably complete and systematic classification of their more important kinds. A full and sufficient explanation of them, though, has never yet been given. The problem, notwithstanding, must certainly admit of a solution. There must have been a worthy cause for such remarkable divergences. They are too numerous to have been accidental, too significant to have been intentional. Although thus far no satisfactory account of them has been put forth, the need of a new and thorough investigation

[1] *Der masoretische Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung des Buches Jeremias*, Regensburg, 1875.

of them has often been expressed, and has much more frequently been felt. In view of the importance of the problem, it appears a little singular that some of those who have maintained the existence of a twofold text-recension have not endeavoured to present a complete and scientific proof of their hypothesis. Even the conservative critic, Keil, significantly says, "None of the advocates of a special text-recension, which lay at the basis of the Alexandrian version, has given himself the trouble more accurately to investigate the nature of the translation." [1]

A fresh and full discussion is thus considered desirable, as well by some of those who commonly depreciate the value of the Septuagint, as by all of those who look upon it as a most important textual authority. The question of the variations is too momentous to remain unanswered, at least, to rest without an earnest effort being made to answer it. Its solution must affect the true interpretation of many portions of this old prophetic book. A minute examination is, moreover, necessary, in order, if possible, to determine which of these two ancient authorities

[1] "Keiner von den Verteidigern der Hypothese einer der alexandrinischen Uebersetzung zu Grunde liegenden besondern Textrecension hat sich der Mühe unterzogen, die Beschaffenheit dieser Uebersetzung genauer zu untersuchen." *Biblischer Commentar über den Propheten Jeremia*, etc., p. 24.

is the more correct, or which more nearly represents the original form of the book as it existed in the prophet's day. Only by close and careful investigation can the comparative excellence of each text be estimated. The inquiry has a further importance still. It concerns the critical relation of the Greek and Hebrew texts for all the ancient Jewish Scriptures. As Scholz has well observed, "The solution of the question is not alone important for the Book of Jeremiah, but decisive for the criticism of the entire Old Testament. Should the decision fall in favour of the Septuagint, then the opinion of the almost absolute trustworthiness of the Hebrew text must be not immaterially modified."[1]

After discussing briefly the chief features of the Septuagint translation of Jeremiah, in the Introduction to his critical commentary on this book, Graf emphatically asserts, "With the innumerable evidences of the arbitrariness and capriciousness of the Alexandrian translator, it is quite impossible to give his work—for one can scarcely call it a translation —any critical authority, or infer from it a different form of his Hebrew text from that which has been

[1] "Die Lösung der Frage ist nicht allein für das Buch Jeremias von Wichtigkeit, sondern entscheidend für die Beurtheilung des ganzen alten Testamentes. Fällt nämlich die Entscheidung zu Gunsten der LXX., so muss die Ansicht von der fast absoluten Zuverlässigkeit des hebräischen Textes nicht unwesentlich modifizirt werden." *Der masoret. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung*, etc., pp. 4, 5.

handed down to us."[1] This judgment is unjust, and can be proved to be untrue. The Alexandrian version cannot, indeed, be properly called a translation of the present Hebrew text. In this sense, and in this sense only, Graf's statement is unquestionably true. There must have been a special text from which the version has been made. On no other hypothesis can the divergences between the Greek and Hebrew be explained. That the Septuagint does not reproduce the Hebrew text as known to us is very obvious; that it does represent another and a very different text is quite demonstrable. The peculiar arrangement of many portions of the book, especially of the prophetic parts, furnishes a probable indication that it once existed in another form from that in which we have it in our Hebrew Bibles; but the nature, as well as the number, of the variations furnishes conclusive evidence that such a supposition is correct.

Before proceeding to adduce the arguments for the existence of a special text-recension, which formed the original of the Alexandrian version of Jeremiah, it may be advisable to present in brief

[1] "Bei den unzähligen Beweisen der Eigenmächtigkeit und Willkürlichkeit des alexandrinischen Uebersetzers ist es ganz unmöglich seiner Bearbeitung — denn Uebersetzung kann man es kaum nennen—irgend eine kritische Auctorität zuzuerkennen und daraus auf eine von der uns überlieferten verschiedene Gestalt seines hebräischen Textes zu schliessen." *Der Prophet Jeremia*, Einleitung, p. lvi.

an outline of the plan proposed for the proving of this hypothesis. Either the omissions from the Greek, which amount to a few thousand words, or the additions to the Greek, which number several hundred words, are sufficiently significant of themselves for such a purpose; but these two classes of variation together render the evidence cumulative. A great variety of minor differences also gives the combined arguments additional strength. Each line of proof will be developed by itself. Afterwards the sum-total of the evidence will be taken as establishing the hypothesis beyond a doubt. The chief divergent features between the two texts may be grouped conveniently in five general classes, namely, (1) Omissions of letters, words, phrases, verses, and paragraphs; (2) Additions of letters, words, phrases, and sentences; (3) Transpositions of letters, words, verses, and chapters; (4) Alterations of mood, tense, gender, person, number, and case; (5) Substitutions of parts of speech, rhetorical expressions, syntactical forms, proper names, etc. This order will be followed throughout the investigation, and the evidence afforded by each class of variation will be indicated in its proper place.

It should be noted here that these five terms have been adopted simply for convenience' sake, some of them having always been employed by

critics in discussing the character of the Septuagint translation of this particular book. Certain variations have so long been characterized as Omissions, and certain others as Additions, by those who have attributed all the divergences between the Greek and Hebrew texts exclusively to design that it is expedient to retain these terms, but only with a meaning modified to suit the present hypothesis of a special text-recension. In this discussion, the variations are not in any sense, or, indeed, in any instance, regarded as intentional. They are regarded simply as textual characteristics, or as recensional peculiarities. This theory assumes that the translator, in every case, endeavoured to reproduce the text before him, as literally and as faithfully as the genius of his language would justly allow.

With this view of the translation, the hypothesis implies that these words must be understood as being used only in an accommodated sense. Taking the Massoretic text as the accepted standard, and making it the basis of the investigation, by Omissions are meant forms and expressions in the Hebrew that are wanting in the Greek; by Additions are meant forms and expressions in the Greek that are wanting in the Hebrew; by Transpositions, Alterations and Substitutions are meant peculiarities of reading which these terms naturally

express, but peculiarities that belonged in general to the individual manuscript that formed the original of the Alexandrian version. An occasional instance of each class of variation may have arisen from oversight, on the part of the translator or transcriber, but not properly from intention. A variation, moreover, may have been due sometimes to accident, but never to design. With this explanation of the sense in which these terms are used in this investigation, it will be in order now to exhibit the proof, furnished by each species of divergence, of a special text-recension from which the Septuagint translation has been made.

CHAPTER II.

THE VARIATIONS—OMISSIONS.

BECAUSE of their number and significance, the Omissions claim consideration first. In pointing out and dealing with their several species, an endeavour will be made to give a reasonable explanation of each kind, and also to show the folly and unfairness of ascribing them to carelessness, to ignorance, to haste, or to design. The inadequacy of the first three theories has already been evinced. The fourth hypothesis, because of its general acceptance by leading scholars, demands a special examination. By way of testing it thoroughly, it will be necessary to consider carefully the causes of omission which its chief defenders have supposed are everywhere manifest throughout this book.

It is assumed by Graf and others that the translator must have been responsible for the omissions, because of the improbability of any later writer having added such a quantity of matter to the Massoretic text. This is a most remarkable

assumption. It is not fair to suppose either that the omissions were made capriciously by the translator, or that they were inserted arbitrarily by a later hand. The alternative suggested is as unnecessary as the method of reasoning is unjust. It is simply begging the question to assume that all such variations arose from one or other of these two causes, or, indeed, from both of them put together. Many of the omissions, as some of the ablest critics have admitted, appear to have been due directly to interpolation at a date subsequent to the time of the Septuagint, although, doubtless, some of them may have existed in the Palestinean recension long before the work of translation was commenced.

Granting with Graf that it is improbable that a later writer should have added the omissions, it is still more improbable that the translator should have left them out. This supposition practically implies on his part personal dishonesty—dishonesty, too, of a very serious sort, inasmuch as he has nowhere given an intimation of any such design. Such a charge has never been substantiated against the translator of any ancient classic work. The Septuagint translators were appointed to prepare for general circulation a Greek version of the Hebrew Bible, and the Scriptures must have seemed to them as holy as they seemed to any

other learned Jews. That any one of these men should have capriciously abridged his text appears to one unprejudiced incredible and inconceivable. The sacred character of his text, and the solemn nature of his task, alike forbid the supposition that many, much less most, of the omissions were due to arbitrary purpose on his part. He must have been an honest man, who did his duty conscientiously and in good faith.

The unreasonableness of the alternatives assumed by Graf appears so evident as scarcely to require to be more fully pointed out. As, however, he repeatedly refers to them, it seems important, in this connection, to quote Bleek's observations in regard to them. His judgment is deliberate and just. After speaking of the extreme literalness and fidelity of extensive portions of the Septuagint translation of this book, he says, "It is, therefore, altogether improbable that the translator elsewhere, and in so many places, should have allowed himself such arbitrary alterations, and especially omissions, as must have been the case, if all the changes which his text furnishes against the Hebrew-Massoretic text had proceeded from him. Even so little is it at all probable that these changes in general should be placed to the account of later transcribers of the Septuagint. For there would occur in the manuscripts of the Septuagint even greater deviations

from the Hebrew text, and, in part, greater coincidences with it, than is the case, or than already was the case at the time of Origen."[1]

Notwithstanding the evident unreasonableness of Graf's hypothesis, he alleges further, not only that the translator deliberately omitted difficult and, to him, unknown and unnecessary expressions, but also that he, in his constant striving after brevity, systematically abridged his text. This system of abridgment, Graf believes, is very manifest. He professes to discover traces of it throughout the entire book. Believing that the translator started out with the intention of being concise, Graf accuses him of having utterly disregarded the prophet's style, and of having left out terms at pleasure whenever he failed to understand, or happened to mistranslate, a word or phrase. Unrighteous as this accusation seems, even Hitzig, who is often favourable in his judgments of the

[1] "Es ist schon deshalb durchaus unwahrscheinlich, dass der oder die Uebersetzer selbst sich anderswo und an so vielen Stellen solche willkürliche Aenderungen und besonders Auslassungen sollten erlaubt haben, als der Fall müsste gewesen sein, wenn von ihnen alle die Aenderungen herrührten, welche ihr Text gegen den hebräisch-masorethischen darbietet. Ebenso wenig ist irgend wahrscheinlich, dass dieselben im Allgemeinen auf Rechnung späterer Abschreiber der Sept. kommen sollten. Denn da würden in den Handschriften der Sept. selbst grössere Abweichungen und theilweise grösseres Zusammentreffen mit dem hebräischen Texte stattfinden, als der Fall ist und als schon zu Origenes Zeit der Fall war." *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Fünfte Auflage, pp. 320, 321.

Septuagint, admits a frequent tendency on the part of the translator to curtail his text, and also to omit important matter from a verse or passage, if the remainder only seemed to furnish a tolerably complete sense. The admission of the one critic is as unworthy as the allegation of the other.

The constant and unimportant repetitions that characterize the writings of Jeremiah have given a certain measure of plausibility to this hypothesis, because they are so much more numerous in the Hebrew than in the Greek; but the theory is no more reasonable or satisfactory on that account. If the translator had a system of omission, he certainly did not adhere to it, for he frequently leaves in his text the very class of words he is accused of systematically leaving out of it. Quite often, too, this is the case, even when the equivalent expression is wanting in the Massoretic text. Such inconsistencies are incompatible with the supposition of a system. The omissions really indicate neither system nor design. The charge of systematic abridgment, moreover, implies stupidity, as well as dishonesty, on the part of the translator, and can be easily refuted. It is only reasonable to believe that he endeavoured in every case to give, so far as possible, an accurate rendering of the original which he used.

As Graf is the ablest and most distinguished

advocate of the theory of design, and as his defence of it is both the fullest and the strongest that exists, there appears to be a great propriety, as well as a great advantage, in making his discussion the basis, in a general sense of the term, of the present investigation of the different kinds of variation. If the falsity of his view can be demonstrated, then the truth of the hypothesis of a special text-recension, which formed the Hebrew original of the Alexandrian version, must follow as a necessary and inevitable conclusion.

It is not easy accurately to classify the great variety of divergences which Graf discusses somewhat unmethodically in the Introduction to his commentary, but at least nine species of omission may be indicated as characterizing the system of abridgment which he believes the Greek translator adopted and observed. Each class requires a special examination, and will be considered in the order most convenient for discussion. An effort will be made to answer Graf's objections respecting each and every class.

1. The translator has omitted certain set phrases and fixed forms, which are peculiar to Jeremiah, and which are repeated with exceeding frequency in the Massoretic text, because he considered them unimportant and unnecessary. For instance, for the constantly recurring formulæ, "Jehovah

Sabáoth," and "Jehovah Sabáoth the God of Israel," "Jehovah" only, as a rule, occurs in the Septuagint, and the word "Sabáoth," according to Graf's estimate, is wanting fifty-six times. The phrase, "thus says Jehovah," fails equally often with this latter term, and the form, "declares Jehovah," is omitted sixty-four times in the Greek.

The continual repetition of these formulæ in the Hebrew, though a remarkable peculiarity of the prophet's style, is entirely unnecessary. In not a single case where they are absent from the Greek is their presence needed by the context. The sense is always good, and the style is generally better, without them. Sometimes one of them, perhaps, would be appropriate where it is wanting in the Septuagint, but such instances are very rare. Hitzig, for example, thinks that "declares Jehovah," in chap. xxv. 7, improves the construction of the sentence; but he cannot claim that the phrase is really essential. Its presence or absence is chiefly, if not entirely, a matter of taste. Scholz's explanation of the constant recurrence of these words in Hebrew is worth considering. He says, "Not fewer than one hundred and seventy-seven times is the phrase, N'um Adonai, repeated, and, indeed, in numerous places where it can only have the meaning that it is repeated, in order to insure that the thing said is certainly true, because it is the

word of God, somewhat as a preacher appeals to Bible passages as to the word of God."[1]

Had it been the purpose of the translator arbitrarily to abridge his text by omitting every unimportant or unnecessary expression, he might have much more frequently omitted such formulæ. He surely would have omitted them, too, in harmony with some rule. Instead of this being the case, these forms are found in many places where, according to Graf, they should not appear, if systematic omission had been the translator's aim. This species of omission is further proved to have been unintentional on his part by the important fact, apparently overlooked by Graf, that the Greek often has some one or other of these forms where the Hebrew has them not. Without noticing the numerous instances in which a similar formula occurs in each text, it may be sufficient here to give some illustrations of the foregoing statement.

It should be mentioned, before pointing out the passages, that they are not confined to any particular part of the translation, but are widely

[1] "Nicht weniger als hundertsiebenundsiebzigmal wird im masorethischen Texte die Phrase Ne'um Adunai wiederholt, und zwar in zahlreichen Stellen, wo sie fast nur den Sinn haben kann wiederholt zu versichern, dass das Gesagte gewiss wahr sei, weil Gottes Wort, etwa wie ein Prediger sich auf Bibelstellen als auf Gottes Wort beruft." *Der masoret. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung*, etc., p. 101.

scattered throughout the whole work. In chap. ii. 2, "says Jehovah;" in chap. v. 1, "declares Jehovah;" in chap. xvi. 2, "says Jehovah the God of Israel;" in chap. xxxii. 28, "the God of Israel;" in chap. xlix. 18, "Sabáoth;" in chap. l. 21, "declares Jehovah," are present only in the Septuagint. In chap. xxiii. 29, "declares Jehovah" occurs twice in the Greek, but only once in the Hebrew; and in chap. xxiii. 30, for "declares Jehovah" in the Hebrew, "declares the Lord God" is given in the Greek. In vers. 37, 38 of this latter chapter, instead of "says Jehovah," the Septuagint has, in each verse, "says Jehovah our God." In chap. li. 62 the Greek also presents the two words "Lord Jehovah" for the single word "Jehovah." Even the phrase, "thus says Jehovah," which often serves to introduce a new or sudden turn of thought, is not in this sense uniformly found in either text. It, too, is wanting in Hebrew once, at least, namely, chap. ii. 31, where it appears in Greek.

2. The translator has omitted synonymous words and pleonastic expressions, which seem to have been used in Hebrew, either to strengthen a clause or to intensify a thought, because he considered all such terms superfluous. When several terms of this kind came together he is supposed to have regarded one or two of them,

at most, as quite enough, and, for this reason, to have purposely determined not to reproduce them all in his translation.

This supposition might possess some plausibility, at least, if such omissions could be regularly or systematically traced, though even then it would be most improbable. No regularity, however, can be discovered. In the Hebrew text, for instance, chap. i. 10, there are four verbs of destruction, while in the Septuagint there are only three. In each text the verbs of destruction are followed by two verbs of restoration. If the variation had been due to design, the translator would undoubtedly have omitted two words instead of one. The parallelism then would have been perfect; while, as the verse now stands, it is imperfect. It should be observed, moreover, that the combination here in Greek is identical with that in Hebrew, chap. xviii. 7. In this latter place, though, the Septuagint has only two of the foregoing verbs. It should be noted further that in chap. xxxi. 28, where five verbs of destruction appear in Hebrew, only the first and the last appear in Greek. Had these omissions been the outcome of a system, such irregularities could not have occurred.

Again, in Hebrew, chaps. vii. 4; xxii. 29, for the sake of emphasis, it is supposed, there is a

threefold occurrence of the phrase, "the temple of Jehovah," in the first passage, and also of the word "earth" in the second passage; while, in Greek, there is but a twofold occurrence of the corresponding term in each particular verse. For the reason indicated, the increased emphasis, the Hebrew is regarded as superior to the Greek. As an analogy in favour of the former, "Holy, holy, holy," Isa. vi. 3, has been cited. The cases, though, are scarcely parallel, and the analogy suggested is not by any means conclusive, either for the Hebrew or against the Greek. There is no good ground for holding that sufficient force is not expressed in each of these two passages in the Septuagint, nor is there any reason to believe that the absent words were left out by design. If desire for brevity had been the cause of these divergences, no repetition needed to have been made at all. A single use of each term would have been enough.

Another example of a similar sort is found in chap. xlvi. 20, where the verb "come" occurs twice in the Hebrew and only once in the Greek. But, in this latter verse, as Hitzig rightly holds, the Septuagint gives a vastly better meaning than that which the Hebrew gives; and the reading, "comes upon her," which the Greek presents, is not only the one supported by many ancient

authorities, but also is the one acknowledged by Graf to be the simpler of the two. The reading of the Septuagint is evidently correct. Although superfluous expressions are not so frequent in the Greek as in the Hebrew, yet more or less unnecessary words and phrases are sometimes found in the former when they are wanting in the latter, as, for example, "land," chap. i. 15; "from all the countries," chap. iii. 18, etc. In every instance of this species of divergence there must have been a corresponding deviation in the ancient manuscripts. At all events the Greek translator, doubtless, reproduced the reading which he found before him in his text.

3. The translator has omitted short sentences and half-verses which are not necessary to the meaning of a verse, but which are essential to the parallelism of its members, because he regarded them as redundant. In this way, by his constant striving after brevity, he not only has impaired the prophet's composition, but also has ignored a prominent peculiarity of Hebrew style, especially in poetry.

In this, as well as in the foregoing, species of omission, Graf argues that the variations must have arisen from the arbitrariness of the translator, because of the incredibility of any reviser or any editor having supplemented them, when the

style of Jeremiah was already too diffuse. Having, in a previous section, shown the unfairness and unreasonableness of this argument, it is sufficient here to add that it is more conceivable that an editor should have inserted harmless terms occasionally for the sake of balancing a sentence, or of perfecting a parallelism, than that the translator should have mutilated the prophet's style by capriciously abridging his Hebrew text. It is not necessary, however, to assume either of these alternatives in order to explain the deviations, except in certain passages which really bear traces of revision, and which will be indicated in the proper place. By whom or when revised, of course, is quite unknown. The passages thus expanded and interpolated appear in their revised form in the Massoretic text.

In the majority of instances in Greek where variations of this kind occur, the parallelism is not at all disturbed, much less destroyed, by the omission. Even in those cases where the Hebrew parallelism is thought to be superior to the Greek, the sense in Greek is almost invariably unimpaired by the divergence. The form of chap. xii. 3 is more pregnant and, it may be, more poetical in Hebrew than in Greek, but it cannot be justly claimed that the style of the Septuagint is imperfect, or that the text is incomplete. In some of

Graf's examples, as, for instance, chaps. xx. 5; xxi. 4; xxix. 12; xlvi. 14, not only is the parallelism of the Septuagint unaffected by the various divergences, but also the symmetry of the verse-members is excellent in every case. Could it be shown that the parallelism of the Greek was frequently inferior to that of the Hebrew, it would afford no proof of arbitrary omission on the part of the translator. It would simply indicate the character of the manuscript he used.

In many places, perhaps, it may be admitted that the parallelism of the Hebrew is somewhat better than that of the Septuagint, but this is far from being universally, or even commonly, the case. Quite frequently the two texts agree; but, when they disagree, the one is often practically as symmetrical as the other. In a number of important passages, though, the parallelism is decidedly improved by the reading given in the Greek. Examples of this kind are found in chaps. ii. 20, 24; iv. 15, 19; v. 20; xviii. 7; xxv. 9; xxxix. 17. So far as this species of omission is concerned, unless it can be believed that the translator sometimes changed a reading with reference to the parallelism, and at other times without reference to it, it must be naturally assumed that he always tried to give a true translation of the text he had. This charge of over-

looking a marked peculiarity of Hebrew style cannot be sustained. In view of all the circumstances of the case, it seems surprising that it should ever have been seriously made.

4. The translator has omitted minor explanations and detailed descriptions, where he could not leave out entire verses, because he looked upon them as irrelevant. By so doing, he has destroyed the rhythm of the sentences. Omissions of this kind, it is maintained, abound throughout the Septuagint, particularly in the narrative portions of the book.

This charge implies that the translator mutilated his ancient text, because he had not a proper acquaintance with one of the most conspicuous features of the Hebrew language. Like the foregoing charge, it really carries its own refutation with it. Without being influenced by a powerful prejudice, it is impossible for a moment to suppose that the rhythm was either disregarded or overlooked. A cultured Alexandrian scholar, who was born and bred, perhaps, in Judaism, as well as taught and trained in classic literature, cannot have been deficient in linguistic feeling, or wanting in literary appreciation of the peculiar genius of the ancient Jewish tongue. The English and German translators of the Old Testament did not overlook such manifest peculiarities of style as the Hebrew

idiom presents, some sixteen or seventeen centuries later, when, as critics all acknowledge, the grammatical niceties of the language were most imperfectly understood. Want of rhythmical perception or appreciation would not have led the Septuagint translator to mutilate his sacred text. The charge implies the grossest ignorance, as well as the greatest inconsistency and dishonesty.

Some of Graf's examples in support of his assertion are exceedingly unfortunate, to say the least. Chap. xxii. 30 has been selected as a specimen of a mutilated sentence, but the missing member, "he shall not prosper in his days," is not really required. The rhythm of the verse in Greek is good, and the meaning given is complete. Indeed, the sense in which the additional words in Hebrew should be understood can only be determined by the latter portion of the verse, which is also differently rendered in each text. Chap. xxv. 3 has been adduced as another illustration of a dismembered verse, but the lacking clause, "the word of Jehovah was to me," was not left out by design. If the conjunction *καὶ*, as Graf asserts, shows that the absent words must have been present in the original of the Septuagint, it does not prove that the translator omitted them. They may have been overlooked by a subsequent transcriber. The translator surely would not leave out

words essential to the construction of the verse in Greek. He must, at least, have understood the genius of his mother tongue.

In discussing this species of omission, Graf again resorts to his favourite practice of maintaining that, in one passage after another, the sentences and clauses wanting must have been omitted by the translator, because there was not the least occasion for a later writer to insert them. The first sentence of chap. xxiii. 10, "For the land is full of adulterers," was left out, he says, because of its apparent inappropriateness. Its nature quite excludes the supposition of its subsequent insertion, he believes. The words appear to be most inappropriate, it is true, but their absence is in favour of the Septuagint, to the original of which they certainly did not belong. Several of Graf's illustrations argue nothing for or against either of the texts. They simply indicate that the original of the one was shorter than that of the other. The text of the one is generally just as good as the text of the other, though the Greek is much conciser in chaps. xxxiv. 10, 11; xxxv. 8; xxxvi. 17, 32; xxxviii. 12; xlii. 20, 21; xliv. 29. In chap. xxxvi. 6 the sentence, "which thou hast written from my mouth, the words of Jehovah," is probably a gloss taken from ver. 4, as Hitzig thinks; and in chap. xl. 4 the whole second half of the verse is

possibly an interpolation, as Movers and Hitzig both believe.

That the rhythm of the Hebrew is sometimes superior to the rhythm of the Greek is, doubtless, true; but this fact furnishes no fair reason to assert that the difference was due to the caprice of the translator, or to his ignorance of style. To be convinced of the injustice of this allegation, it is only necessary to observe the accuracy and fidelity with which he everywhere has done his work, having reproduced the original Hebrew with a literalness which extends, wherever practicable, to the order of the words as they must have stood in his ancient Hebrew manuscript. Respecting this class of variations also, it is more reasonable to suppose that certain clauses, here and there, were, at some time, inserted in the Massoretic text by Jewish sticklers for style, who were too regardful of the rhythm, than that they were omitted from the Septuagint by the Greek translator, who, according to Graf's theory, was quite regardless of it. The latter both observed it and preserved it with the utmost care. If the Greek text is less rhythmical than the Hebrew, and to some extent, perhaps, it is, he cannot be held responsible for the deficiency. It is possible that an occasional word or clause may have been overlooked in the translation or in the transcription, but this, as well as

the foregoing, species of omission can only be explained by the hypothesis of a special text-recension.

5. The translator has omitted proper names and personal or official titles, which appear with frequency, and with some degree of regularity, in the historical parts particularly of the Massoretic text, because he thought them entirely unnecessary.

Wichelhaus attaches great importance to the annexing of the father's name to the names of persons, and indicates the rule by which, in Hebrew, he supposes they occur. He says, "If, therefore, in any passage, the name receives a special stress, if, as it were, the whole personality appears on the scene, the surnames are annexed according to the same law, by which it is, at one time, uttered with a lighter, at another time, expressed with a heavier, emphasis."[1] These titles, though, are not nearly so important as he believes, nor does their repetition in Hebrew seem to have been governed by any regular rule. Although Graf apparently adopts the extreme view of Wichelhaus, he grants that these appended names and titles are not essential to a right understanding

[1] "Quare si quo loco vis quædam inest nomini, si tota quasi persona in scenam prodit, apponuntur cognomina eadem lege, qua modo leviore pronuntiatur sono, modo altiore voce effertur." *De Jeremiæ Versione Alexandrina*, pp. 70, 71.

of the context, and that their presence or absence is a matter of indifference, so far as they concern the subject-matter of the book.

Graf's assumption, that these admittedly unimportant appendages must have been intentionally omitted by the translator, because it is incredible that a later editor should have given himself the superfluous trouble of introducing such a number of unnecessary names and titles, had they not stood originally in the Massoretic text, is again gratuitous and unreasonable. While some of these variations possibly indicate recensional divergences, others of them very probably were made by a ater hand. Hitzig admits this probability in chap. xl. 9, in reference to "the son of Ahikam, the son of Shaphan," which is in apposition to the name of Gedaliah. At the first mention of Gedaliah in the preceding chapter, ver. 14, and also in the present chapter, ver. 5, as well in the Greek as in the Hebrew, the full form of the name is given, and its repetition here is entirely superfluous. Whether many of these differences were due to subsequent insertion or not, some of them very likely were; and it is unreasonable to suppose that they were the outcome of purpose or caprice on the part of the translator.

Some of this species of omission appear to indicate the primitive character of the Hebrew

manuscript which formed the original of the Septuagint translation. In ancient times such formulæ seem not to have been repeated with so much frequency as they were in modern times. The name "Pashhur," in chap. xx. 6, which Graf suggests could very well be spared after the pronoun "thou," may not have stood in the earliest Hebrew texts, and surely did not stand in the original of the Greek. In chap. xl. and following chapters, the addition to the Hebrew of "the son of Nethaniah" after the name of Ishmael, of "the son of Kareah" after the name of Johanan, and of "the son of Ahikam," or "the son of Ahikam the son of Shaphan," after the name of Gedaliah, is almost invariably unnecessary, wherever it is wanting in the Septuagint. Indeed, after an individual has once, in any given paragraph or chapter, been definitely indicated or described, the repetition of the full form of the name in that particular paragraph or chapter becomes practically superfluous in every case. At the beginning of an entirely new section, there is an appropriateness in expressing a person's name in full, with the surname attached. This is the rule apparently adopted in the other Hebrew books, as Movers very properly has observed.[1]

[1] "Regula enim de cognominibus vel titulis cum nominibus coniunctis hæc est, ut in oratione vulgari historica nomen cum

The frequent recurrence, moreover, of the titles, "the priest" and "the prophet," which characterizes the Massoretic text, is also a species of redundancy. These titles are altogether unnecessary wherever they are wanting in the Septuagint, and their absence is in favour of the originality of the version. In every instance, too, the meaning is just as explicit in the Greek as in the Hebrew. Although, as Graf has stated, the name "Nebuchadnezzar" is wanting twenty-three times in the Septuagint, in no case is the omission necessary to the sense. The context always makes clear who is meant. Instead of being a defect, its absence is a great improvement. For Jeremiah's time the repetition of this name was entirely superfluous. For a later time it may have seemed desirable to a teacher or transcriber. For this reason, Movers rightly regards these repetitions as later glosses. After the death of Jeremiah, he supposes, when Nebuchadnezzar had successors with whom he might possibly be confused, his name was frequently appended.

The charge of systematic omission is perfectly disproved again by the important fact that sometimes such appendages do not appear in Hebrew

cognomine vel titulo tantum initio novæ narrationis coniungi soleat, narratione autem progrediente, nisi maior orationi vis concilianda est, solum nomen admittatur." *De utriusque recensionis vaticiniorum Jeremiæ*, etc., p. 4.

where they do appear in Greek. This fact has been observed by Scholz. He says, "That it did not lie in the purpose of the Alexandrian translator, or in his manuscript, to abridge such names or surnames follows with evidence in abundance from this, that the Septuagint itself in certain passages has such appendages where they are wanting in the Massoretic text."[1] A few examples are sufficient for the purpose; for instance, "the son of Hananiah," chap. xxxv. 4; "the son of Neriah," chap. xxxvi. 14. There are also other appositional repetitions in Greek where there are none in Hebrew, such as "king of Judah," chaps. xxi. 3; xxxvi. 2; "king," chap. xxxvi. 9; "king of Babylon," chap. xxxii. 1; and also "Jeremiah," chap. xxxvi. 18.

6. The translator has omitted sometimes one and sometimes two from the group of words, "sword and famine and pestilence," which quite frequently occurs in Hebrew, because he did not carefully regard the context in which these words were found.

In chap. xxviii. 8, where two of them are want-

[1] "Dass es nicht in der Absicht des alexandrinischen Uebersetzers und seiner Vorlage gelegen ist, solche Namen oder Beinamen abzukürzen, geht zum Ueberflusse noch daraus mit Evidenz hervor, dass LXX. selbst an einigen Stellen solche Zusätze haben, wo sie im masorethischen Texte fehlen." *Der masoreth. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung*, etc., p. 100.

ing in the Septuagint, Graf thinks that the latter text seems to be mutilated by the omission, because this portion of the verse is disproportionate in length to the preceding part; but the single term expressed in Greek is amply sufficient, both for the sense and for the rhythm, if the meaning of the passage be observed. The introductory word in this place is not "sword" but "war;" and the Greek is really superior to the Hebrew, since there is a special contrast in vers. 8, 9 between war and peace. Although the union of the three words now under consideration is common in the Hebrew, their combination is by no means uniform. They vary both in respect to number, and also in respect to order of combination, in different portions of the book. A few illustrations of this variety of number and order may be given.

In chaps. xiv. 12; xxi. 9; xxiv. 10; xxvii. 8, 13; xxix. 17, 18; xxxii. 24, 36; xxxviii. 2; xlii. 17, 22; xliv. 13, the order of the words in Hebrew is "sword, famine and pestilence." Their number and order in Greek are just the same in chaps. xiv. 12; xxxii. 36. This order is changed in both texts in chap. xxxiv. 17, where the arrangement is "sword, pestilence and famine," and also in chap. xxiv. 10, in the Greek, where the arrangement is "famine, pestilence and sword." In chap. xxi. 7 again, the Hebrew has "pestilence,

sword and famine," while the Greek has "pestilence, famine and sword." In the first half of xiv. 15, where only two of these terms occur, both texts are in complete agreement. In chap. xiv. 16, where two of these words also appear in each text, the general order in the Hebrew is reversed, while in the Greek it is retained. Thus the latter has the advantage of arrangement, if it were of any particular significance.

The difference between the Hebrew and the Greek respecting this group of words is thus seen to be only occasional. As examples of irregular arrangement appear in each text, and as two instead of three words also sometimes occur in each, no real importance can be attached either to their order or to their number, and no certain conclusion can be drawn as to which form is the more original or correct. When both of the texts agree, no question of superiority can be raised, and when they disagree, no argument in favour of the one or of the other can be established. In this particular, the one text is practically as good as the other. A diversity existed, doubtless, in the ancient manuscripts. In view of the foregoing facts, it is manifestly foolish and unfair to suppose that the translator sometimes omitted one of the three words because he saw that only two occurred occasionally in his Hebrew text. Everything

indicates that he tried to give a true translation of the text he had.

7. The translator has omitted names and dates and specifications of various kinds, which abound in Hebrew, because he considered them meaningless or useless.

As Graf believes it impossible to regard such variations in the Hebrew text as glosses, or as in any sense the additions of a later hand, he asserts again that all such terms, when wanting in the Septuagint, must have been capriciously left out. This alternative also is unnecessary and unfair. His illustrations, too, do not support his charge. He instances, first, the omissions, of which there are several, in chap. xxviii. 3, 4; but the Septuagint here contains all that is essential to the sense, and really presents a more concise and finished reading than the Hebrew furnishes, as Hitzig honestly admits. The latter also points out very properly that the second half of ver. 3 in Hebrew, on account of the date in ver. 1, was quite superfluous for the readers of Jeremiah's time, and that the long repetition in ver. 4 was rendered desirable solely by reason of the additions to the Massoretic text.

In the remaining examples of this sort adduced by Graf, there is no more evidence of design in the omissions than in the passage just considered.

The reading of the Septuagint in chap. xxi. 7 is the usual one throughout this book, and closely corresponds to that of both the texts in chaps. xix. 7, 9; xxxiv. 21; xliv. 30. Had the absent words, "into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon," been present in his text, the translator would undoubtedly have reproduced it. The variation in chap. xxxvi. 9, instead of indicating wilful omission and abridgment, as Graf and Hitzig claim, rather affords a clear proof of a twofold reading of this passage in the ancient manuscripts. For the sentence, "all the people that came from the cities of Judah unto Jerusalem," in the Hebrew, there is only the clause, "the house of Judah," in the Greek. But the one word "Judah" is common to both the texts, so that they cannot have been originally alike. The supposition is absurd. The same may be asserted also of the supposed omissions in chaps. xlii. 9; xliv. 24. The Septuagint translation of these passages is terse and good, and must have been made from a manuscript which was different from the present Hebrew text in manifold respects.

Again, the illustrations Graf has given of design in the absence from the Septuagint of detailed information respecting individuals, as in chap. xxvi. 22, or in the absence of one from a succession of well-known names, as in chap. xxxvi. 25

26, or in the absence of definite chronological data in some of the superscriptions, as in chaps. xxv. 1; xlvii. 1, are really no more fortunate or satisfactory. In not a single example is there any apparent or probable, much less certain, evidence of intentional omission. The text of the Greek is shorter than that of the Hebrew, but in every instance it is excellent, so far as this class of variation is concerned. The Septuagint appears to represent as accurately as the process of translation and transmission rendered possible the Hebrew text which the translator used.

8. The translator has omitted difficult words, uncommon terms, and unfamiliar phrases, whose meaning was, perhaps, obscure, or possibly unknown, because he thought such terms unsuited to the context in which they stood.

The expression "plundered," in chap. iv. 30, is supposed to be an illustration of this kind; but the word is quite unnecessary, as well as difficult with certainty to construe. Some critics consider it in apposition with the preceding pronoun "thou;" but Hitzig, with whom Graf agrees, holds that it is in apposition with the subject of the succeeding verb. Although the form of the word is admittedly irregular in its present position, it cannot have been omitted through ignorance, because it frequently occurs elsewhere

in Jeremiah, or by intention, because the translator could have rendered it then as readily as we are able to render it now.

The first half of chap. l. 36, "A sword is upon the boasters, and they shall become foolish," cannot have been omitted because the words were either difficult or unknown, as Graf seems to suggest by citing it in this connection, inasmuch as they are all simple words and easy to translate. The same is also true of the phrase, "and all the kings of Zimri," in chap. xxv. 25. The proper name is a familiar one, but it is nowhere else in Scripture used of a distinct body of people, and its application here in that sense is somewhat difficult to explain. At least, it is not known what particular tribe is meant, as the race referred to cannot be certainly identified. The translator had no greater reason to omit the words than we have, on account of the uncertainty of the reference in this obscure clause.

There is nothing either inappropriate or offensive in the use of the expression for "eunuch" in chap. xxxviii. 7 that should have led to its intentional omission, as Graf seems also to suggest. On the contrary, by the first mention of a person, as in the present case, the description is exceedingly appropriate. Even though the term had seemed unsuitable, which is incredible, that would have

formed no justification for omitting it, had it stood in the original text. The term "fatness" again in chap. xxxi. 14 was not omitted for either of the reasons indicated, because it was a familiar word, and is several times translated in other parts of the Old Testament. A further proof of this assertion is afforded by the circumstance that, instead of this term, the expression, "the sons of Levi," appears in the Septuagint. The translator would not have ventured to omit one word and to insert two words in its place. The original of the Greek was evidently different from that of the Hebrew, and the reading of the former in this verse is similar to the reading of the latter in chap. xxxiii. 18.

The last word in chap. xxxvi. 18, Graf thinks, was omitted because it was unknown to the translator. Hitzig also thinks that he skipped over it on account of its obscurity. The Greek, though, had a verb, which was very similar in form and signification to the root of the noun here rendered "ink." This fact must have been generally known, as well as the fact that fluids of various colours were used for writing by the ancient Jews. Moreover, had the word appeared in the Alexandrian recension, its meaning would have been at once apparent from the connection, even though to the translator its derivation had appeared obscure,

which seems entirely improbable. Some interpreters regard the word in this place as superfluous, because the meaning of the sentence is self-evident without it. On this account, they claim, it must have been omitted; but it is much more reasonable to suppose that it was wanting in the original of the Septuagint. The word was altogether unnecessary for the people of the prophet's time; and for the princes, to whom it is addressed, the information it contains was absolutely useless. As Scholz observes, "They knew as well as Baruch that the utterances were written 'with ink,' because they had just had them read to them from the roll. Thus the author of this remark has not understood the point in question."[1]

On close investigation, there seems to be no evidence in the book that the translator ever left out words because they were either difficult or unknown. If the derivation of a word was doubtful, or if its meaning was obscure, he transcribed it literally, as, for instance, *ἀσίδα* in chap. viii. 7; *χαυῶνας* in chaps. vii. 18; xliv. 19. Modern translators, it should be observed, have often done the same thing. A similar transcription of the

[1] "Dass die Aussprüche 'mit Tinte' geschrieben waren, wussten sie so gut wie Baruch, denn sie hatten sich ja aus der Rolle vorlesen lassen. Der Urheber dieser Bemerkung hat also den Fragepunkt nicht verstanden." *Der masoreth. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung*, etc., pp. 103, 104.

first word, it may be pointed out, is found in the Alexandrian version of Job xxxix. 13, and of the second word, in the English version of Amos v. 26. Nothing could have justified a translator in leaving out or passing over words because they were obscure or difficult. He was bound either to translate them or to reproduce them. Scholz's remark on this point is very reasonable. He says, "A translator cannot simply pass over unknown words. The words, as they stand, should and must be translated. In cases, therefore, where the ordinary means for finding the meaning of a word fail, there remains nothing but either to seek to divine the meaning, or to apply for advice to the kindred Semitic languages, or finally to give the Hebrew word untranslated back again with Greek letters. Our translator has pursued all these ways. This observation is of high importance for the characteristic of his work. It evidences the groundlessness of the assertion that he has left untranslated words and passages, because they seemed to him particularly difficult."[1]

9. The translator has omitted lengthy passages,

[1] "Ein Uebersetzer kann nicht über unbekannte Wörter einfach hinweggehen. Die Wörter, die dastehen, sollen und müssen übersetzt werden. Es erübrigt also in Fällen, wo die gewöhnlichen Mittel, die Bedeutung eines Wortes zu finden, versagen, nichts, als entweder den Sinn zu errathen suchen, oder bei den verwandten semitischen Sprachen sich Raths zu erholen, oder endlich das hebräische Wort unübersetzt mit griechischen Buchstaben wie-

which are substantially the same as those occurring in earlier chapters of the book, because he thought their repetition undesirable, and thus endeavoured to avoid it.

Repetition, both on a large and small scale, is peculiarly characteristic of the writings of Jeremiah, particularly in the prophetic portions of his work. Quite frequently whole paragraphs, some of them significantly long, from the earlier prophecies, are nearly word for word repeated in the later ones. In many instances, they seem to suit the context in the second place almost as well as in the first. Not always, though, by any means, can this be said to be the case. Sometimes the repetition is manifestly inappropriate. Many of these repeated passages appear to be interpolations. Some of them should possibly be so regarded even when they are found in both the texts. When they occur in Hebrew only, their want of genuineness is scarcely at all questionable.

Approximately thirty-seven of these longer passages are repeated in the Hebrew Bible. Thirty of them, or thereabouts, are correspondingly re-

derzugeben. Alle diese Wege hat unser Uebersetzer betreten. Diese Beobachtung ist von hoher Bedeutung für die Charakteristik seiner Arbeit: sie zeigt zur Evidenz die Grundlosigkeit der Behauptung, dass er Wörter und Stellen, weil sie ihm besonders schwierig vorkamen, unübersetzt gelassen habe." *Der masoreth. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung*, etc., p. 24.

peated in the Alexandrian version. The seven passages that are wanting in the Septuagint are apparently, in every instance, in the Hebrew out of place. Their insertion in the latter cannot be accounted for with certainty. Whether they were incorporated in some Hebrew manuscripts, at a very ancient date, or were added to the Massoretic text, at a period later than the Septuagint, are questions to which no positive answer can be given. They probably belong, however, to more modern times. Kühl's suggestion is worthy of consideration. He supposes that these additions came into the Massoretic text at a later time, and that they did not belong to the original of the Greek translator, or, if they did, that they simply appeared in the margin of his text as glosses which he naturally did not adopt.[1] In any case, they seem to be interpolations for reasons that will now be fully pointed out.

Taking these seven omitted passages in the order in which they are repeated in the Hebrew, it will be observed, first, that chap. viii. 10–12 is almost identical with chap. vi. 12–15. The idea in each is just the same, and the language is very slightly different. The repetition is not merely superfluous, but, as Hitzig indicates, it is disturbing to the sense. Ver. 13, which is united in thought to the

[1] *Das Verhältniss der Massora zur Septuaginta*, p. 56.

clause, "their fields to them that shall possess them," in that part of ver. 10 which is common to both texts, begins badly and awkwardly, as it stands in Hebrew, having no natural connection with what immediately precedes. In chap. vi. 12–15, on the other hand, the passage is appropriate and in place. There no valid objection to it can be urged. Its absence from the Septuagint in this chapter is significant. Even Graf acknowledges that its presence does not suit the context in the latter so well as in the former place. Whether it be a gloss or not, it certainly lies under the suspicion, pointed out and emphasized by Hitzig, of having been sometime supplementarily interpolated in the Hebrew text.

With the exception of the last few words, "but they did them not," chap. xi. 7, 8 is wanting in the Septuagint. The omitted verses somewhat correspond to chap. vii. 24–26. The first part of ver. 8 in the former chapter is almost exactly the same as ver. 24 in the latter chapter. Since Graf refers to it in this connection, the passage claims attention for that reason. In the first place, it should be observed that the passages, though similar, are not sufficiently alike to have suggested the omission of one of them in order to avoid the repetition, even though it were probable that the translator ever left out words and verses on that ground. In the

second place, the three words expressed in the Greek do not prove, as Graf asserts, the presence in the original of the Septuagint of the omitted portions of the passage. According to the Hebrew text, these three words are to be understood as referring to the forefathers mentioned in ver. 7; but there is also a logical connection between them and ver. 6, to which they directly refer in the Greek, and to which they may also properly refer in both the Hebrew and the Greek. The repetition here is quite unnecessary, and Hitzig is in error when he says that without it vers. 9, 10 would be ungrounded and unintelligible. In the third place, the repeated passage may have been, as Movers is inclined to view it, a simple gloss taken from chap. vii. 24-26.

A similar explanation must be given of chap. xvii. 3, 4, which coincides in Hebrew pretty nearly with chap. xv. 13, 14. The modifications in the two passages are slight, or, at least, unimportant. Both Graf and Hitzig regard the passage in the former place as the original of the passage in the latter place. Both also regard the two verses as destroying all connection where they stand in chap. xvii. 3, 4. Their reasoning, though, in each respect, is altogether inconclusive. To believe with them respecting the origin of chap. xv. 13, 14, is to suppose that a portion of an earlier chapter was

taken from a later one, and was inserted where it would disturb the sense. The supposition is utterly unreasonable. It is also inconsistent with the principle of omitting parallel passages which Graf unworthily ascribes to the translator. Ver. 10 of this latter chapter is evidently connected in sense with ver. 15, but the continuation of thought does not require the leaving out of vers. 11–14, as Graf gratuitously asserts. Whether the passage in question is more appropriate in chap. xvii. than in chap. xv., as the critics mentioned claim, is open to discussion. The fact that it appears in chap. xv., both in Hebrew and in Greek, affords conclusive evidence of its great age, if not of its absolute genuineness; and the fact that it does not appear in chap. xvii. of the Septuagint renders its repetition there suspicious, to say the least. Besides, chap. xvii. 1–4 is all omitted in the Greek, and the whole paragraph may be dropped out without any detriment whatever to the context. For this reason, in addition to the reasons that have been already indicated, it is practically certain that the first part of this chapter did not belong to the translator's manuscript.

An examination of chap. xxx. 10, 11 leads to a very similar result. The passage occurs in substance in chap. xlvi. 27, 28, and is, in the one place or the other, undoubtedly a gloss. Perhaps,

in each place, it should be regarded as an interpolation. If so, it must be very old, since, in this latter chapter, it is found in both the texts. De Wette, Hitzig, Movers, on account of some divergences from the prophet's usual style, which seem to characterize them, consider these two verses spurious, and ascribe them to the so-called Deutero-Isaiah. With the exception of the phrase, "my servant Jacob," which is frequent in the second part of Isaiah, Graf answers their objections as to authorship with considerable success. While there is nothing in the language absolutely incompatible with Jeremiah's style, there is something peculiar in a few of the expressions used. Graf and Hitzig, however, both consider the passage more appropriate in chap. xxx. 10, 11 than in chap. xlvi. 27, 28, and they suppose it was omitted from the former chapter by the translator, because it succeeds the latter chapter in the Septuagint. Whether the passage suits the one place better than the other, or whether it is genuine in either place, where it is omitted in the Greek, it was, doubtless, wanting in the original of the Septuagint, a possible alternative which even Hitzig honestly suggests.

The long paragraph, chap. xxxiii. 14–26, is a very significant omission, the partial occasion for which, Graf believes, was the consideration that it was composed, for the most part, of literal or sub-

stantial repetitions of preceding passages. Vers. 15, 16 almost coincide with chap. xxiii. 5, 6; vers. 17, 18 sound a little like xxxv. 19; vers. 20, 22, 25, 26 somewhat resemble chap. xxxi. 35–37. The chief occasion, though, he thinks, was the non-fulfilment of the prophecy concerning David, and respecting the promised increase of the Levites and of the Davidic dynasty. He also attributes somewhat to the translator's supposed constant habit of abridgment. But the genuineness of this paragraph is held in doubt by Michaelis, Jahn, and Hitzig, the latter of whom regards the whole section as a succession of single sentences taken from various sources. Bleek, de Wette, and Movers share substantially the same doubt. From the style, as well as from the subject-matter of the prophecy, a strong argument for the spuriousness of the passage has been presented by the last four critics. The question of its genuineness, however, does not really concern this brief discussion. The special purpose of the present investigation is to show the great injustice of asserting that it was intentionally omitted by the Greek translator. It is much more easy, as Bleek has justly said, to conceive how a later writer might have added the whole prophecy than to imagine why any person should have left it out. It may possibly have belonged to the original of the Massoretic

text, but certainly did not belong to the original of the Septuagint translation.

A still more positive result is obtained by the examination of chap. xxxix. 4–13. The narrative coincides in general, though not in detail, with the historic account in chap. lii., and also in 2 Kings xxv. The genuineness of the greater portion of this chapter has long been questioned by interpreters. The absent passage, whether spurious in this place or not, can with no more propriety be ascribed to Jeremiah than can the fifty-second chapter of this book, or the corresponding passage of the Second Book of Kings. The verses wanting do not properly belong in this connection. They not only interrupt the narrative, but also they disturb the order of the thought. The account which they contain, too, does not agree with that in chap. lii. In that chapter, the ninth day of the fourth month is mentioned as that on which provisions in the city failed; in this chapter, it is mentioned as the day on which the city was taken by storm. The connection, moreover, between ver. 3 and ver. 14, as in the Septuagint, is easy and natural; whereas ver. 13, which is a repetition of ver. 3, seems to have been inserted in the Hebrew for the purpose of uniting ver. 12 to ver. 14. By omitting vers. 4–13, the narration from chap. xxxviii. 28 proceeds logically and connectedly to the end. This fact,

though, furnishes no reason to suppose with Graf that the whole passage was omitted, because it seemed unnecessary to the translator. He did not find it in his text. Its absence from the Septuagint affords important evidence of the critical value of this ancient version. Its testimony respecting this very dubious paragraph is weighty, and also worthy of the fullest consideration.

The remaining passage, chap. xlviii. 40, 41, which is substantially the same as chap. xlix. 22, admits of treatment similar to that which the foregoing passages have received. It is entirely unnecessary, where it is absent from the Greek, and any plausible reason for its repetition has never yet been given. Graf supposes that this passage was omitted from the Septuagint, because chap. xlviii. 40, 41 in the Hebrew comes after chap. xlix. 22 in the Greek. But it cannot have been omitted on that ground, as Hitzig properly contends. Both he and Movers consider it an extraneous, if not a spurious, addition. Owing to the divergences between the two passages in the Hebrew, the adding of a predicate and the changing of a preposition, the former critic holds that Jeremiah hardly would himself have used, and in the later passage, chap. xlix. 22, have corrected, his own words. No intentional omission on the ground of repetition can in fairness be supposed. The absent

verses did not belong to the original of the Septuagint translation, or else they would have been carefully reproduced.

Each of these seven passages, where wanting in the Septuagint, is, when critically and impartially considered, apparently out of place. That they were in every instance glosses by a later hand, as some interpreters suppose, seems altogether probable; but that they were not present in the translator's manuscript seems absolutely certain. It is incredible that the translator should have found these passages in his text, and then have left them out, because he thought them spurious or inappropriate. It is also inconceivable that he should have wilfully omitted them, because he tried, as much as possible, to avoid unnecessary repetitions, inasmuch as thirty times or more he has repeated passages quite as unnecessary to the context as these appear to be. If he found the whole thirty-seven before him, why did he omit just these seven passages? Why should they, and they alone, have been left out and all the others have been left in? The only reasonable answer to this question seems to be that they did not belong to his original, and that they are, in every case, interpolations by a later hand. It is significant that each of these omitted passages, apart from its inappropriateness where it is absent from the

Greek, is of doubtful origin and of suspicious character.

If one supposes that these passages really did belong to his original, one must believe that the translator left them out because of their apparent spuriousness or inappropriateness. He cannot have omitted them without first considering whether they were genuine or not. If, after consideration, he decided not to reproduce them, as Graf supposes, then very little value can be attached to his translation. It is merely an arbitrary and untrustworthy piece of literary work without any critical worth whatever. After showing the mechanical and unreliable character of the translation, if such an unworthy opinion of the translator be entertained, Kühl pertinently says, "Why then did he do it only in these seven passages and not in every place, where—sometimes at no very great intervals—repetitions occur? and wherefore did he, in spite of his former lack of critical acumen, in his omissions which, by this supposition, would still be a product of his arbitrariness, hit upon exactly the seven passages, whose originality, indeed, is doubtful in the very highest degree? With that view, these questions ever remain unanswered, and they elicit from every impartial observer the acknowledgment that here, and if here, then, of course, in other passages as well, the Septuagint is wholly in

the right. At all events, though, too depreciative is the judgment of Graf, who will attribute to it no authority whatever."[1]

Graf's theory respecting the seven passages just considered apparently rests on the assumption that they are always wanting in the Septuagint where, according to the order of the prophecies in that version, they, if repeated, would appear a second time. This supposition, though, is incorrect. One exception to this rule exists, and that is quite sufficient for the purpose of disproof. Chap. xxxix. 4–13 is absent from the Greek, while it is present in chap. lii., notwithstanding the fact that the latter chapter ends the book in both the Hebrew and the Greek. Although each of these seven repeated passages appears to be of very dubious character, and, although each one, if not entirely inappropriate where it is wanting in the Septuagint, might be, at least, omitted without at all disturb-

[1] "Warum that er es denn blos an diesen sieben Stellen und nicht überall, wo (manchmal in nicht allzugrossen Zwischenräumen) Wiederholungen stattfinden? und weshalb trifft er bei seinen Auslassungen (trotz seines sonstigen Mangels an scharfsinniger Kritik), die bei dieser Annahme doch ein Produkt seiner Willkür wären, gerade die sieben Stellen, deren Ursprünglichkeit in der That im höchsten Grade zweifelhaft ist? Diese Fragen bleiben bei jener Ansicht immer unbeantwortet, und sie nöthigen jedem unparteiischen Beobachter das Zugeständniss ab, dass hier, und wenn hier, dann jedenfalls auch an anderen Stellen, die LXX. in vollem Recht ist, jedenfalls aber das Urtheil Grafs zu abschätzig ist, der ihr gar keine Autorität zuschreiben will." *Das Verhältniss der Massora zur Septuaginta*, p. 60.

ing the connection or injuring the sense, it is remarkable that Graf attributes the omission in each case to the self-same arbitrary practice by which he persistently endeavours to account for the various species of omission that have already been discussed. When it suits his purpose, he accuses the translator of the grossest ignorance, and, when such a supposition is clearly contradicted by the facts, he accuses him of the greatest arbitrariness. This kind of reasoning is inconsistent and confutes itself. His theory is altogether too accommodating. It maintains that the translator systematically abridged his text, and then it holds him responsible for numberless omissions which no sort of system can explain.

It should be also noted here that many other passages are repeated in the Septuagint, not where they occur the first time in the Hebrew, but where they occur the second time. This is a most significant fact, and it affords additional disproof of Graf's unjustifiable and unjust assumption. Scholz has an important observation on this point. "If, however," he says, "there was need of a still further proof, the supposition of intentional omission is excluded by this, that the Greek translation, in a number of passages, does not express repeating and like-meaning verses, while it has them in a second place. How would that be

conceivable with a translator who translates without consideration?"[1] Such a supposition is both unreasonable and absurd. The translator had neither reason nor desire to abridge his text. Had the repetition of unnecessary matter been his aim, he might have left out many times as much as he has been accused of leaving out. An unprejudiced investigator, who carefully considers all the facts, must grant at once the unreasonableness of Graf's accusation. He must also admit with Kühl, not only respecting the seven long repeated passages in particular, but also respecting the numberless unnecessary omissions in general, that the ground of their omission was not a subjective but an objective one; that is, it lay not in the arbitrary procedure of the translator, but in the peculiar form of his original.[2]

It is still more remarkable, if possible, that in each of the other cases in which a parallel passage is repeated in the Septuagint of this book, Graf

[1] "Völlig aber ausgeschlossen ist, wenn es noch eines weiteren Beweises bedürfte, die Annahme von dem absichtlichen Auslassen dadurch, dass die griechische Uebersetzung in einer Anzahl von Stellen sich wiederholende, gleichlautende Verse das erste Mal nicht ausdrückt, während sie dieselbe an zweiter Stelle hat. Wie wäre das bei einem Uebersetzer, der leichtfertig übersetzt, denkbar?" *Der masoreth. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung*, etc., p. 26.

[2] "Der Grund der Auslassung ist kein subjektiver, d. h. er liegt nicht in dem eigenmächtigen Verfahren des Uebersetzers, sondern ein objektiver (äusserer), d. h. er liegt in der Gestaltung seines Originals." *Das Verhältniss der Massora zur Septuaginta*, p. 56.

supposes that the translator had forgotten that he had once already rendered it. Otherwise, he seems to think, all such passages would have been omitted. In his opinion, the translator must have been not only incompetent and inconsistent, but also endowed with a very treacherous memory, which frequently forgot to apply the principles of his own most imperfect scheme. Such ingenuity of explanation in a Biblical scholar is exceedingly unusual, to say the least, and certainly was worthy of a better cause. How such a monstrous supposition could have been deliberately suggested seems itself almost inexplicable. The assumption that the translator had a system, and then forgot to apply it in some thirty out of thirty-seven lengthy passages, is so ridiculous that it scarcely claims a formal answer; and yet, since Graf has made the accusation, it must not be passed by without some attention, notwithstanding its absurdity.

Apart from the utter improbability that a definite rule of translation could be forgotten four times, at least, as often as it was remembered by one who is supposed to have made it specially for his personal guidance, it seems sufficient further to observe that some of the passages repeated in the Septuagint stand so near to each other as to render the idea of forgetfulness wholly inconceivable to a person who takes into account all the facts of the

case. Scholz has answered Graf's suggestion on this point aptly and completely. He says, "If it is a principle of the translator to pass over passages and expressions, which repeat themselves, as superfluous in a second place, how could he so neglect this his own principle that he applied it in only a comparatively small number of cases, whereas, in by far the great majority of places, he likewise translates the recurring passages, and, indeed, not merely in cases where an oversight was possible,—although that from the first is improbable in the highest degree, as certainly not the next best into whose hands the book fell devoted himself to the translation. We have rather, with the greatest likelihood, to suppose that it is the work of a 'Teacher in Israel,' who by frequent reading had made himself familiar with the book in all of its details."[1]

[1] "Wenn es Grundsatz des Uebersetzers ist, Stellen und Aussprüche, die sich wiederholen, als überflüssig an zweiter Stelle zu übergehen, wie konnte er diesen seinen Grundsatz so ausser Acht lassen, dass er ihn nur in einer verhältnissmässig kleinen Anzahl von Fällen anwandte, in den weitaus meisten Stellen dagegen die wiederkehrenden Stellen ebenfalls übersetzt, und zwar nicht blos in Fällen, wo ein Vergessen möglich war—obgleich das von vorneherein im höchsten Grade unwahrscheinlich ist, da sicherlich nicht der Nächstbeste, dem das Buch in die Hand fiel, sich an die Uebersetzung machte. Wir haben vielmehr mit höchster Wahrscheinlichkeit anzunehmen, dass es die Arbeit eines 'Lehrers in Israel' ist, der mit dem Buche in allen seinen Einzelnheiten durch vielmaliges Lesen sich vertraut gemacht hat." *Der masoreth. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung*, etc., p. 26.

The examination of a great variety of minor omissions, which Graf does not attempt to classify, as well as a considerable number of longer ones, which have, as yet, not been discussed in this investigation, affords still further proof that the translator used another and a different text from that transmitted to us by the Massorites. Both their nature and their number are too significant to be overlooked. Not simply do they supply important evidence for the hypothesis of a special text-recension, but they furnish useful material for the history of the whole Old Testament Scriptures. They also shed a flood of light upon the present character and condition of the Massoretic text. On the ground of being either unnecessary, or superfluous, or inappropriate, or interpolated, some of them have been rejected by Graf himself. On the same ground many of them have been rejected by Hitzig or by Movers, or by both. On a similar ground, moreover, others of them must be regarded either as spurious or as suspicious, to say the very least.

The great majority of the omissions may be characterized generally as unnecessary; that is, neither are they requisite for the complete grammatical construction of the text, nor are they essential for a proper understanding of it. This is true especially of all or nearly all of those belonging to

each of the nine species of omission that have already been investigated. It is also just as true of all or nearly all of those remaining undiscussed. Their presence or absence is practically immaterial, although, in several instances, the reading in the Hebrew may be considered preferable to the reading in the Greek. By characterizing the omissions in general as unnecessary, it is not meant that they are generally spurious, although unquestionably they sometimes are; nor is it meant that many of them did not belong to the original of the Massoretic text, although undoubtedly some of them did not. They are thus characterized principally against Graf and others who assert that the omissions from the Septuagint indicate a mutilated text.

A considerable number of omissions may be characterized appropriately as superfluous. They are not only unnecessary, but also redundant. This redundancy, in many places, doubtless, points to textual divergences. These may have generally belonged to the Palestinean recension. Whether this can always be claimed to be the case, however, is very questionable. The question, too, is one that cannot easily be answered. Such omissions are described in this connection as superfluous, some of them on his own admission, especially again against Graf and his arbitrary theory of intentional omission on the part of the translator.

A significant number of omissions must be characterized properly as inappropriate. They are not only unnecessary and superfluous, but also out of place. In many passages, they either interrupt the progress of the narrative, or disturb the harmony of the thought. For various and manifest reasons they do not properly belong where they are wanting in the Greek. It is not always easy to account for their existence, although a possible explanation may, in some instances, be pretty safely suggested. Their origin was, doubtless, due to a variety of causes, which extended over a long period of time.

A still more significant number of omissions can only be characterized correctly as interpolated. They cannot be truthfully described by any other term. They are not only unnecessary and superfluous and inappropriate, but also spurious as well. They cannot have been uttered by the prophet, nor can they have belonged to any authorized edition of his writings. That some of them are ancient appears probable; but how old, of course, it is impossible to tell. That many, if not most, of them arose after the making of the Septuagint translation seems practically certain; but when or by whom they arose can never be determined. It may be possible, however, to account for some of them conjecturally.

The omissions of letters, of which there are several, are also worthy of some consideration here. This species of omission is of special interest, because it shows how a number of important variations may be naturally explained. Some of these divergences may have been recensional; others of them may have been transcriptional. Except in so far as the context pronounces the one form or the other to be preferable, it is difficult to decide which reading is the more primitive. By placing the examples together, their comparative excellence may the more easily be estimated. The instances are as follows:—

תְּפַח—תִּפָּתַח, i. 14; בְּכַפַּיִךְ—בִּכְנָפַיִךְ, ii. 34; כַּעֲרָבִי—כְּעֹרֵב, iii. 2; וַיִּמָּנוּ—וַיִּמָּנְעוּ (?) רַבִּים—רְבִבִים, iii. 3; מִפִּיו—מִפָּנַי, iv. 1; וּמְנָעָה—וְהַמְעֻנָּגָה (?) vi. 2; כָּלֹה—כָּל, vi. 6; וְאָן—וְאֵין, vi. 14; מְשׁוּבֹתָם—מַחְשְׁבוֹתָם, vi. 19; אֵשׁ—אִישׁ, vi. 23; l. 42; נָשִׁיתָה—נַשְׁחִיתָה, xi. 19; כַּלֵּם—וָאֲכַלֵּם, xv. 16; מְשֻׁבֹתֵינוּ—מַחְשְׁבוֹתֵינוּ, xviii. 12; זֵרֶם—זָרִים, xviii. 14; עֲנִי—לַעֲנָה, xxiii. 15; בַּעֲלוֹת—בְּהֵעָלוֹת, xxxvii. 11; אֵלֵינוּ—אֱלֹהֵינוּ, xliii. 2; בְּכַרְמִשׁ—בְּכַרְכְּמִשׁ, xlvi. 2; קוֹלֵךְ—קְלוֹנֵךְ, xlvi. 12; כָּעָרוֹד—כַּעֲרוֹעֵר, xlviii. 6; דִּלְתָיִם—דִּבְלָתָיִם, xlviii. 22; הֵשִׁיתוּ—הִשְׁחִיתוּ, xlix. 9; וּבָאִיִּם—וּבָאֵימִים, l. 38; וְאַכְנֵזִים—וְאַשְׁכְּנַז or וְאַכְנַז, li. 27; מִנְחָה—מְנוּחָה, li. 59.

CHAPTER III.

THE VARIATIONS—ADDITIONS.

Convincing as is the evidence obtainable from the Omissions of a twofold text-recension of this book, the evidence derivable from the Additions is, if possible, more conclusive still. Their number, as well as their importance, has not as yet been properly appreciated. Even Bleek, who is a great admirer of the Alexandrian version and a vigorous advocate of different text-recensions, has failed to point out their significance. He says, "The Septuagint only seldom has additions, and these consisting simply of single words or members."[1] This statement, however, is scarcely accurate. Though small compared with that of the omissions, it is true, their number, notwithstanding, is considerable. They really amount to several hundred words. Significant as their number is, their nature is much more significant. Instead of being confined exclusively to "single words

[1] "Nur selten hat die Septuaginta Zusätze, und nur in einzelnen Worten oder Gliedern bestehende." *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 318.

or members," as he says, they are composed occasionally of sentences, and frequently of groups of words, which sometimes modify the meaning of a passage, at other times explain a difficulty in the Massoretic text, at other times again exhibit a reading, not only different from but also superior to the one which the Hebrew gives.

Respecting the additions, Graf is almost as unreasonable and inconsistent in his allegations as he is in reference to the omissions. He says, for instance, "Of the additions to the Massoretic text, which, on the other side, occur in the Septuagint, only a few are to be found which can prompt the supposition that they exhibit genuine text, that might have been omitted from the present Hebrew through the fault of copyists."[1] This bare assertion, of course, is true; but the implication is false. There is no ground whatever to suppose that variations of this kind were often due to oversight or omission on the part of those who anciently transcribed the Massoretic text, although it may not be improbable that here and there a word or two may have been overlooked. The additions are too numerous and significant to be explained on any rational

[1] "Unter den Zusätzen zu dem masoretischen Texte, die andrerseits in LXX. vorkommen, finden sich nur wenige, die zu der Annahme veranlassen können, dass sie ächten Text darstellen, der in dem jetzigen hebräischen durch Schuld der Abschreiber weggefallen wäre." *Der Prophet Jeremia*, Einleitung, p. xlix.

hypothesis other than the one suggested and illustrated by the examples of omission that have already been discussed. They afford conclusive evidence of a special text-recension. They represent, undoubtedly, a very ancient text, and bear invaluable testimony to its general excellence throughout.

The theories of explanation held by Graf are not merely incorrect but contradictory. He claims that the translator systematically abridged his text, and contends that the omissions from the Septuagint were due to his persistent striving after brevity, because of the impossibility of believing that they were left out by a later writer or transcriber from the Hebrew text. He then suggests that everywhere a later hand is recognizable in the additions as well as in the omissions of the Septuagint. If it is incredible, when discussing the omissions, to suppose that such variations were due to a later hand, it is certainly just as incredible when discussing the additions. According to this hypothesis, to be consistent, he should attribute all the variations to the Greek translator. When it suits his convenience, though, he ascribes them to the translator, and when it does not, he ascribes them to a later editor or reviser. Graf seems to be driven to this desperate alternative respecting the origin of the additions by perceiving that, although he

believes that the translator systematically abridged his text, no one could believe that he abridged it and enlarged it at the same time.

As the omissions prove the improbability of Graf's hypothesis, so also the additions prove its impossibility. They demonstrate not only the unfairness of asserting that the translator was always striving after brevity, but also the unreasonableness of supposing that he either added to or took away from the ancient Hebrew text which he employed. It is useless to suppose that he neglected his own principle of systematic omission, or that he forgot in all such cases to apply it. Even Graf himself sees the preposterousness of such a supposition. Hence he regards the additions, in almost every case, as spurious, and endeavours to account for them by alleging that they belong to a later time. Having given a brief discussion of their character, he says, "After the explanation, there can be no longer a doubt that the text-form presented by the Greek translator is a mutilated and corrupted one, that arose, in a much later time, out of the Hebrew text which has been preserved to us."[1] How far this state-

[1] "Nach dem Dargelegten kann es keinem Zweifel mehr unterworfen sein, dass die von dem griechischen Uebersetzer dargebotene Textgestalt eine aus dem uns hebräisch erhaltenen Texte in viel späterer Zeit entstandene verstümmelte und verderbte ist." Einleitung, p. li.

ment is from harmonizing with the facts will be evinced by carefully examining the additions. That they were not taken from the air, to render literally a German phrase, is very evident; and that they were due neither to translator nor transcriber can be very clearly shown. As a rule, they bear the marks of age and genuineness upon them, and thus proclaim their own originality or primitive character. As Graf ascribes them now to one cause and then to another, it is by no means easy to arrange his objections to their genuineness systematically. It seems better, though, so far as practicable, to attempt to classify them. For convenience' sake, they may be generally grouped in five distinct classes.

1. Many additions prove themselves to be spurious, because they violate the sense of the verses or the parallelism of the verse-members. This is a somewhat serious accusation. Graf indicates only a few instances of this kind, and none of those are really to the point.

In chap. iv. 29, for example, where the Hebrew has "they go into the thickets," the Greek has "they go into the caves and hide themselves in the thickets." It is unfair to say that the parallelism of the verse in Greek is violated. There may just as properly be three predicates as two. If one supposes with Schleusner that the Hebrew

word translated "thicket" was repeated in the Septuagint, one has still to account for the additional verb "to hide." The latter clearly indicates an ancient reading, a similar form of which occurs in other parts of the Old Testament, as, for instance, in 1 Kings xviii. 13. The two texts in the present verse seem never to have been the same. Besides the additions in the Greek the minor variations are important, and in favour of the Septuagint. Instead of going up "into the rocks," the Greek has going up "upon the rocks;" instead of "the whole city," it has "the whole country." This latter reading is superior to the one in Hebrew, inasmuch as "country" forms a natural contrast to "city" in the following member of the verse, as Hitzig freely admits. In this same member the absence of the article from the word for "city" is also favourable to the Septuagint. The people would naturally flee from every city in the whole land, and not merely from the whole city of Jerusalem.

The added words, "and your olive-yards," in chap. v. 17, cannot be fairly said to violate the parallelism. There may as well be three as two particulars. The fact that a similar addition is found in the Septuagint translation of Ps. iv. 8 affords a further proof that the text employed by the translator presented in each passage a

reading different from the Massoretic text. If the parallelism of the Greek were inferior to that of the Hebrew, which is not really the case, it would not disprove the genuineness of the Septuagint, nor would it prove that the words were added either by the translator or by a later hand. It would rather indicate their originality, because, to an impartial mind, it is incredible that any person should have intentionally injured the Hebrew style by adding to the text of Scripture. The words in Greek are surely genuine.

In chap. xxxii. 19, the peculiar clause, "the great God Sabáoth, and Jehovah of great name," was neither added by a later hand, as Graf assumes, nor arbitrarily inserted in its present place, as Hitzig says. The variation seems to have been due, partly to an accidental repetition, and partly to an imperfect condition of the original Hebrew text. The words, "the great God," were apparently repeated by mistake, either in transcribing the Hebrew original or the Greek translation. The remaining words evidently arose from imperfection in the ancient manuscript, as they contain exactly the letters, but in a different order, of the last three words of the 18th and the first word of the 19th verse. In the Massoretic text, we have יהוה צבאות שמו : גדל ; in

the Septuagint, we have צבאות שם וגדל יהוה or צבאות וגדל שם יהוה. Thus, by means of the Hebrew letters, the variation may be explained. The explanation is rendered the more probable, inasmuch as the last three words of ver. 18 are wanting in the Septuagint, but are found, as indicated, in the 19th verse. The case affords an illustration either of textual imperfection, or of transcriptional carelessness, or, perhaps, of both.

In chap. xiv. 15, for the words, "by the sword," in Hebrew, the Greek has "of grievous death they shall die." This cannot have been an arbitrary variation, as Graf suggests. The translator would not, and a later writer could not, consistently with reason, so have changed the sacred text. The words in the Hebrew are very simple, and evidently belonged to the Palestinean recension. The sentence in the Septuagint is most unusual, and must have belonged to the Alexandrian recension. It occurs but once in the Hebrew Bible, and that is in chap. xvi. 4 of this book; whereas it occurs twice in the Greek translation, once in this latter chapter, and once in the passage under consideration. The expression, therefore, is peculiar to the prophet Jeremiah. In each passage of the Septuagint the words in Greek are identical; and they are just as appropriate in the one as in the other. The very peculiarity of the language is a

proof of its genuineness, or, at least, of recensional differences in the ancient Hebrew manuscripts.

There may be, now and then, a passage in the Greek where, owing to the presence of an additional word or clause, the parallelism is less perfect than in the Hebrew, but such instances, if such there be, are really very rare. In the great majority of cases the additions either affect the parallelism favourably, or they affect it not at all. In none of these places, though, is there the slightest reason to suppose that the improvement is due either to translator or reviser. Examples of superior parallelism due to the additions in the Septuagint may be found by comparing the Hebrew with the Greek in chap. i. 17, where the latter has "fear not before them and be not dismayed before them" instead of "be not dismayed at them, lest I dismay thee before them;" v. 20, where it has "the house of Judah" instead of "Judah;" ix. 25, where it has "the sons of Moab" instead of "Moab."

2. Many additions, inconsistently with the former system of abridgment, are taken from other passages, and inserted where they do not properly belong, or where they are altogether out of place. This assertion can be shown to be entirely incorrect by carefully examining the passages which Graf has cited by way of illustration.

The added phrase, "because they shall not profit you at all," chap. vii. 4, Graf says, is taken from ver. 8. But the form of the expression in the latter verse is not the same as that which is given here. The one is not a repetition of the other, nor can the one be fairly claimed to have been taken from the other. The language in each verse is different, and the number of words used also varies. Even had the phrases been identical, no reason for supposing that the one was repeated from the other would have been apparent. At all events, as they are now found, each one is most appropriate in the form, as well as in the place, in which it stands.

In like manner, the added clause, "to your own hurt," chap. vii. 9, Graf considers, is taken from ver. 6. His supposition here again is just as incorrect as in the preceding case. The Septuagint renders the clause in ver. 6 literally, and, moreover, exactly as it also stands in Hebrew, chap. xxv. 7. In this latter passage, on the other hand, the words are wanting in the Septuagint. Why should a translator be accused, for no conceivable reason whatever, of omitting words because they were unnecessary in one place, and of inserting them in another place where they were quite as unnecessary? Only a foolish theory would admit such an absurdity. The words were neither

arbitrarily added in chap. vii. 9 nor arbitrarily omitted in chap. xxv. 7. The first two verses of this present chapter are wanting in the Greek; there are also several other omissions, of more or less importance, in other parts of the chapter. The significant additions which likewise characterize it, as well as the omissions, point to a special text-recension.

The addition, "and those who are going in at these gates," chap. xix. 3, Graf regards as a repetition from chap. xvii. 20. The suggestion, though, is quite gratuitous. The words are just as appropriate in the one place as in the other. The combination is a somewhat common one. It occurs in chaps. xvii. 20; xxii. 2, of both the Hebrew and the Greek, and also in chap. vii. 2, of the Hebrew. In this latter verse, however, it is wanting in the Greek. It is unreasonable to suppose that the words were purposely omitted in chap. vii. 2 and purposely added in chap. xix. 3. The long additional expression, "and I wrote the deed and sealed it and called witnesses," chap. xxxii. 25, Graf says, is taken from ver. 10. As the transaction was important, and as its bearing on the future of the nation was likely to be permanent, it is natural that the prophet should have spoken as the passage reads in the Septuagint. The translator surely had no reason to repeat the sentence in the present

verse, if he did not find it in his manuscript. A further proof that the original of each text was different is furnished by the important fact that, while the two sentences in question are added to the Greek in this member, the sentence, "and call witnesses," is omitted from it in the preceding member, of the verse.

Graf also supposes that the addition, "more than their fathers," chap. xvii. 23, is taken from chap. vii. 26, to which it bears a close resemblance. Hitzig considers the whole verse wanting in originality, as well as in appropriateness. Whether right or not, his supposition is much more plausible than that of Graf. It is far more likely that the whole verse was interpolated at some time, than that the additional clause in Greek was inserted by the translator. If chap. xvii. 23 be an interpolation, it must have been added prior to the existence of the Alexandrian version. In any case, the rendering of the verse in Greek points to recensional differences, and indicates that the translator reproduced the text he had before him.

3. Other additions are inserted in a manner that is altogether improper and inappropriate. An examination of the instances cited by Graf will show this allegation also to be false.

The sentence, "great is the distress upon thee," chap. xi. 16, cannot have been intentionally added

by any one at any time. Even if the hypothesis of arbitrary insertion on the part of the translator were probable, which is not the case, he would not have ventured to insert words inappropriately, or in a way to render the construction difficult. The presence of the sentence here is certainly not easy to explain. Either it was found in the translator's manuscript, as the Greek text is very plain, and gives a tolerable sense; or it was accidentally added by an ancient copyist, as the variation may be partially explained by means of the Hebrew letters. This latter alternative seems not unreasonable or improbable, inasmuch as the word for "great" occurs in one part of the verse in Hebrew and in another part of it in Greek. Possibly, therefore, it was overlooked at first, and afterwards inserted with the other words which may have been repeated by mistake. The words in Greek might easily have been derived from the words in Hebrew, especially if the original text were indistinct, in the following manner:—גדלה הצרה אשר (יש) עליך for גדלה הצית אש עליה. There is a similarity in the sound, as well as in the form, of the Hebrew words in each case.

The added words, "to their meeting," chap. xxvii. 3, did not arise from arbitrary insertion, as Graf assumes; nor did they arise from careless repetition of similar consonants, as Hitzig asserts.

There is no real resemblance between ירושלם and לקראתם, as the latter critic claims. The words make excellent sense in the connection in which they stand. There is nothing improper or inappropriate about them. The phrase is quite uncommon in Jeremiah, but the idea expressed is good. It unquestionably belonged to the Alexandrian recension at the time that the Septuagint translation was made. The addition of the word, "waters," at the beginning of chap. xlvi. 8, was also not due to intention. As the same word ends the preceding verse in Greek, it may have been repeated by accident. It is, perhaps, more probable, however, that it belonged to the translator's text. The reference here is to the troops of soldiers sweeping over the country like the rushing billows of an overflowing river. The repetition of the word, moreover, makes the reading correspond exactly to the figure used for an army in Isa. viii. 7. The waters symbolize the advancing host of the Egyptians, whose mighty army is likened to the annual inundation of the Nile, just as in this latter chapter the Assyrian army is likened to the periodical floods of the Euphrates. The added word is not unfavourable to the Septuagint.

The clause, "and of all the land," chap. li. 28, was also not added to the Septuagint, as Graf suggests. It simply occupies another place in the

same sentence. In Greek it stands in the first half, in Hebrew it stands in the second half, of the verse. Although the order of the words in the former is different from the order in the latter, the rhythm of the verse-members in the Septuagint is excellent. The rendering of the verse in Greek is, in several respects, superior to that of the verse in Hebrew, it also should be pointed out. The singular "king" is better than the plural "kings," which appears to be incorrect. All the pronouns in the Septuagint, moreover, refer consistently and properly to the monarch, "the king," whereas in the Hebrew two of them refer to the people, "the Medes," and only one refers to the ruler of the country. It is significant that this one has the same form that each one has in Greek. This fact indicates that the reading, "king of the Medes," is more accurate than "kings of the Medes." It also seems to show that the words, "of his dominion," which are wanting in the Septuagint, may have been added by a later hand to the Massoretic text.

The ejaculation, "so may it be, O Jehovah," chap. iii. 19, is not inappropriate where it stands in Greek, nor can one fairly claim that it did not belong to the translator's text. The words were naturally interjected by the prophet, and they correspond with a similar form of expression in

chap. xi. 5. As the appended words, "falsehoods falsely," chap. xxvii. 15, are simply regarded by Graf as "very useless at least," it may be quite sufficient to reply that this objection does not prove them to be spurious, nor does it prove them to have been intentionally inserted by any one. The same objection merely is urged against the reading, "the sword of Jehovah," instead of "sword," chap. xlvi. 10. In neither of these two cases is the addition absolutely useless. On the contrary, it increases the significance of the statement in each verse. In the latter example, moreover, the definite form in Greek is a classical one, as may be seen at once by a reference to 1 Chron. xxi. 12.

4. Other additions again are explanatory glosses or circumlocutions, which are frequently incorrect. This charge can be as easily refuted as the foregoing ones by studying the examples which Graf adduces in support of his assertion.

The exclamation, "O Jerusalem!" chap. xiii. 20, cannot be shown to be a gloss. It probably represents the only true reading in this place. It belongs as naturally and as properly here as in ver. 27, where it appears in both the Hebrew and the Greek. Even the form of the verse in the Massoretic text indicates that some such word was understood, and possibly, at some time, was expressed. The Hebrew verb is feminine and

singular, while the possessive pronoun which qualifies its subject is plural. "This shows," as Streane has observed, "that the subject is a noun of multitude, viz., Jerusalem personified as the daughter of Zion. This thought harmonizes with the words, 'the flock that was given thee,' the inhabitants of the land in general."[1]

Neither can the additional clause, "a letter to the settlement (captivity) at Babylon," chap. xxix. 1, be proved to be a gloss. The addition does not really interrupt the connection of thought in the sentence, as Hitzig asserts. It rather properly explains exactly what seems to have taken place. Consistently with the rest of the verse, the relative pronoun "which," in the Septuagint, is plural, and refers to "*the words* of the writing" that was sent by Jeremiah as a letter from Jerusalem to Babylon. The whole verse, which is quite as complete in the Greek as in the Hebrew, indicates the existence of a special text-recension. In the first member of the verse in Greek there are two short omissions, "the prophet" and "the residue;" and in the second member there is the important addition just discussed, and there is also a long omission, "whom Nebuchadnezzar had carried away captive from Jerusalem to Babylon." Hitzig

[1] *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, Jeremiah and Lamentations, p. 107.

admits that this latter sentence is rightly wanting in the Septuagint, inasmuch as it is rendered superfluous by the succeeding verse.

The added clause, "upon him," chap. xvii. 5, is not an explanatory note. The sentence is an exceedingly easy one. No explanation whatever was needed to make its meaning plain. Instead of simplifying the verse, the addition renders it, if anything, somewhat more difficult. Neither a translator nor a later writer would have attempted after this fashion to explain the sacred text. In Hebrew the verse reads, "Cursed is the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm;" in Greek the latter sentence reads, "and places the flesh of his arm upon him." The language in the original of each text was just the same, with the exception of the two additional words, "upon him." The pronoun evidently refers to the second word for man, in the first of the two sentences, as its antecedent. The reading in the Septuagint, though peculiar, is perfectly intelligible, and appears to reproduce an ancient form of the Hebrew text which the translator used.

The added sentence, "and they have concealed their cause of stumbling (punishment) from me," chap. xviii. 20, is neither a paraphrase nor a gloss. It is rather a genuine piece of ancient text. It affords a most convincing proof of the hypothesis of

a special text-recension which formed the original of the Alexandrian version. There is no reason whatever to regard it as a gloss with Graf, nor to consider it with Hitzig an excess or a redundance in one verse. Instead of appearing to be an interpolation, it rather bears the appearance of genuineness; and instead of injuring the parallelism of the verse-members, it rather gives them a rhythmical balance. Thus both objections to it are unjust, and the latter, that the words should be rejected because they overload the verse, is really absurd. Hitzig also foolishly supposes that the translator wrongly inserted the sentence after the analogy of ver. 22, because of having incorrectly interpreted it. The sentence is most appropriate where it stands, and gives an increased significance to the verse. There seems to be a happy contrast in the Septuagint between ver. 20 and ver. 23. In the former, addressing Jehovah, the prophet says, "they have concealed their cause of stumbling from me;" in the latter, he says, "let their cause of stumbling be before thee."

The addition in chap. xxii. 17 is also neither a paraphrase nor a gloss. It is another certain proof of a twofold reading in the ancient Hebrew manuscripts. Moreover, the rendering of the Septuagint is capital. In the Hebrew, the first half of the verse reads, "But thine eyes and thine heart are

not but for thy covetousness;" in the Greek it reads, "Behold, neither are thine eyes nor is thy heart good, but for thy covetousness." Instead of "But," the Septuagint has "Behold;" instead of one copula with a negative, it has two negatives of the verb *to be;* and, instead of no adjective qualifying either noun, it has the adjective, "good," qualifying each of the substantives, the very term the verse requires to make the sense complete. The differences between the two texts in this verse are so peculiar and important that they must have been recensional. They cannot have been the outcome of intention on the part of the translator, or on the part of any writer of a later time. There is no unfitness in any of the added words. The variations in the Greek are all appropriate, and represent a classic form of Hebrew text.

5. Some additions are due to ignorance, or to want of understanding, in translating the original Hebrew text. The charge that the translator omitted portions of his manuscript through ignorance appears entirely improbable, but the charge that he or a transcriber added to the text through ignorance seems utterly unreasonable. In not a single instance does Graf establish the probability of this charge.

The addition at the end of chap. i. 17, "because I am with thee to deliver thee, declares Jehovah," does not rest upon an erroneous understanding of

the text, as Graf asserts, nor did it arise from a false interpretation of the preceding clause, as Hitzig says. It affords another striking evidence of a special text-recension. It, moreover, harmonizes perfectly with the context in the Septuagint, which contains encouragement and comfort for the prophet. Neither is the addition taken from ver. 8, as Graf believes. This assurance of the divine presence and deliverance occurs in the Hebrew of this chapter twice, namely, vers. 8, 19; whereas, in the Greek, it occurs thrice, namely, vers. 8, 17, 19. It belongs as naturally and as appropriately in the present place in Greek as in either of the other places in both the Hebrew and the Greek. The Septuagint rendering of the latter half of the verse is almost wholly different from the Massoretic rendering, but it is entirely consistent with itself, as well as with the context.

The added clause, "and concerning this man," chap. xxii. 18, was not inserted, because the translator misunderstood the meaning of vers. 14-17 of this chapter. Between the two texts, throughout these latter five verses, there are minor variations of different kinds and of considerable significance in every verse. The discrepancies, indeed, point clearly to a special manuscript in each case. The present addition is another example of recensional divergences. In Tischendorf's edition of the

Septuagint, the clause is printed as if it were in apposition to "Jehoiakim" in the preceding clause. This construction seems not to be correct. The added words appear more properly to refer to "Shallum the son of Josiah," whose fate the prophet has described in vers. 11, 12. In perfect consistency with this supposition, as Hitzig grants, a plural verb, "they shall be buried," follows in ver. 19 of the Septuagint. The plural verbs in Greek, moreover, in ver. 15 and also in ver. 16, fully confirm this supposition.

The added word "earth," chap. xxxiii. 2, does not seem to have arisen either from intentional insertion or from imperfect understanding. Neither does it necessarily appear so incorrect as Graf assumes. It rather appears exceedingly appropriate where it stands, and seems unquestionably to have belonged to the translator's text. It also gives a necessary completeness to the verse. Properly speaking, it is really another word, and not an additional word in the sentence, inasmuch as it simply takes the place of the second word, "Jehovah," which is wanting in the Septuagint. The repetition of this latter term in Hebrew is somewhat peculiar, if not, indeed, altogether superfluous; whereas, the rendering of the verse in Greek is admirable, Graf's objection to the contrary notwithstanding. To an unprejudiced critic

it seems to be superior, for the reason that it makes much more natural sense, and corresponds much more nearly with the parallel passage, Isa. xlv. 18, which it very closely resembles. The order of the words is slightly different, but the language is almost identical.

The addition of "Jehovah" at the end of chap. xxxviii. 27, Graf characterizes as "quite thoughtless" or unmeaning, but it is by no means certain that his criticism is correct. The verse has a very significant meaning in the Septuagint, and the closing words are quite consistent with the context in the Greek. In ver. 20 of this latter text, instead of urging Zedekiah to obey "the *voice* of Jehovah," Jeremiah is described as urging him to obey "the *word* of Jehovah." In the three succeeding verses in the Hebrew, with some slight verbal variations, the prophet is represented as declaring to the king "the word" which Jehovah had shown him. In the next two verses, the king is represented as requesting the prophet to "let no man know of these words," and to mention but one of the subjects of their conversation, if "the princes" should hear of their private meeting, and should inquire of him the nature of their conference. Shortly afterwards, as seems to have been expected, "the princes" came to Jeremiah, and interviewed him, when he answered them accord-

ing to the commandment of the king. "Then," continues the record in the Septuagint, "they (the princes) left off speaking, because the word of Jehovah was not reported." Instead of being meaningless, the reading in the Greek seems to be the ancient and correct one, and it seems also to explain how the reading in the Hebrew should be understood, inasmuch as in its present form it is somewhat incomplete.

Thus a close examination of the various species of addition, as classified for this investigation, shows how unfounded and unfair are Graf's objections to their genuineness. In not a single instance is his allegation strictly true. In some cases, it is difficult to account with certainty for the additional word or words, but these are very few indeed. They probably were due in part, if not in whole, to the imperfect condition of the ancient manuscripts. The great majority of them, however, were due to recensional divergences. Instead of belonging to a later date than the time of the Septuagint translation, they belong to a much earlier date. Instead of having arisen out of the received Hebrew text, they arose out of a widely different text. Instead of being generally spurious, they are generally, if not always, genuine. If they do not, in every case, exhibit the original text, they do, at least, exhibit a very ancient form of it—a much more

ancient form, perhaps, than that exhibited by the Massoretic text. In numerous passages Graf, as well as Hitzig and Movers, recognizes the superiority of the Septuagint reading, and also the probable primitive character of the additions. In the remaining passages, as a rule, if the Greek does not represent a more primitive reading than the Hebrew, it represents, at all events, the reading of a different recension—the Alexandrian recension.

The additions of letters, of which there are a few, are interesting, inasmuch as they explain the origin of a number of variations. Like the omissions of letters, it is difficult to determine which of them were recensional and which transcriptional, as some of them were evidently due to one cause and some of them to another. The following are the chief examples :—

נֶאֱצַלְנוּ—נִצַּלְנוּ, vii. 10; תִּשְׁאַל—תִּשָּׂא (?) vii. 16; xi. 14; שְׁפָתַיִם—שְׁפָיִם, iii. 21; vii. 29; דִּמְיוֹן—דֹּמֶן, viii. 2; ix. 21; xvi. 4; אֲשֶׁר—אֵשׁ (?) xi. 16; וְהַאֲגֵרִם—וְהַגִּרֵם, xviii. 21; וּבָקַעְתִּי—וּבַקֹּתִי (?) xix. 7; נֶאֱנַחְתְּ—נֵחַנְתְּ, xxii. 23; יְלַחֲכוּ—יֵלֵכוּ (?) xxx. 16; אֲבֵלָה—אֵלֶּה, xxxi. 21; הָעֹמְדִים—הָעֵדִים, xxxii. 12; וּדְלָיָהוּ—וּגְדַלְיָהוּ, xxxvi. 25; בְּגַבְרוּת—בְּגֵרוּת, xli. 17; בְּעָרֵי—בְּשַׁעֲרֵי, xliv. 6; גִּלְעָד—גָּד, xlix. 1; צִירִים—צִיִּים, l. 39; יִתְעַלֵּף—יִתְעַל (?) li. 3.

CHAPTER IV.

THE VARIATIONS—TRANSPOSITIONS.

The character of the Transpositions in the Septuagint is remarkable, and the evidence they furnish of recensional divergences is significant. They comprise letters, words, verses and chapters. Of these four species, some one or other kind occurs in nearly every chapter of the book. The transposition of chapters, being the most manifest and striking, has always attracted much attention. On account of its interest and importance, this species of transposition should be considered first.

From about the middle of chap. xxv. to the beginning of chap. lii. the numbering of the chapters is entirely different. This difference is chiefly due to the position occupied by the nine prophecies against foreign nations. In each text, this group of prophecies stands together; but, in the Greek, it is found near the middle, in the Hebrew, near the end, of the book. In the former, it follows immediately after chap. xxv. 13; in the latter, it begins with chap. xlvi. Not only does

the general arrangement of these prophecies differ widely, but also their particular order of sequence amongst themselves differs considerably. Their order in the Greek is Elam, Egypt, Babylon, Philistia, Edom, Ammon, Kedar, Damascus, Moab; their order in the Hebrew is Egypt, Philistia, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Damascus, Kedar, Elam, Babylon.

Although it is not the special purpose of this investigation to discuss exhaustively either the arrangement or the order of these prophecies, being chiefly concerned with the arguments for a different text-recension, yet the subject is too interesting in itself to be entirely left alone, and too important for the present hypothesis to be very slightly touched. It, therefore, claims a fair and full consideration. The discussion involves two questions—the position and the grouping of these nine prophecies. Respecting each it can be shown that the Alexandrian version exhibits the more ancient as well as the more natural form of this prophetic book.

The first question is of particularly great importance, because of the logical relation between the different parts of the book. It admits, moreover, of a thoroughly critical treatment and of a tolerably certain settlement. The second question is of comparatively small importance, because the

grouping of the individual prophecies is practically immaterial, so long as the subject-matter in each case is substantially the same. This question, further, does not admit of a decisive answer. At least, while the one may seem more original than the other, it, perhaps, can never be determined with absolute certainty which grouping is the more correct. Much may be said, as much already has been said, in favour of the combination in each text. It may, however, be pretty positively settled which one the translator had before him in the manuscript he used.

Taking these questions in the order of their importance, it is necessary to consider, first, the correctness, and, secondly, the originality, of the position of the prophecies in each case. Their position, it should be observed, must be considered independently of the position of similar prophecies in any other book of Scripture. In some of the other books, the prophecies against the heathen do not stand at the end of the work, but occupy a position analogous to that here occupied by the present group in Greek. The analogy, though interesting and significant, is in no way conclusive. The indirect evidence it furnishes, while favourable to the Septuagint, is not sufficient of itself to decide the matter with perfect certainty. The position of this group has nothing whatever to do

with that of either of the other groups. The question, therefore, must be considered simply on its own merits; and it must be determined, if at all, by the relation of these nine prophecies to the general contents of the book. In endeavouring to determine it, reference must be made particularly to the relation between the two parts into which chap. xxv. is divided by their insertion immediately after ver. 13 in the Septuagint, or rather by their removal to the beginning of chap. xlvi. in the Massoretic text.

A careful reading of chap. xxv. in the Hebrew will show that there is really something wanting after ver. 13 to connect it logically with the section which begins with ver. 15. In this latter section there is an enumeration of the nations to which the prophet is said to have been directed by Jehovah to offer, figuratively, of course, the wine-cup of the divine fury; or, in other words, to foreshadow the ruin of those nations whose overthrow should be involved in the general destruction which is described in ver. 11. In the main, the names of these nations correspond with the names of those against whom the nine prophecies in question were proclaimed. For this reason, one would naturally expect them to appear in close connection with the enumeration mentioned. This expectation is realized in the Septuagint.

Here the group of prophecies begins directly after ver. 13, and the section commencing with ver. 15 follows at once as chap. xxxii. In this position, the prophecies stand connected with kindred matter; whereas, in the position which they occupy in the Hebrew, they stand unconnected with any thing whatever of a kindred character. Having, therefore, in this latter text no logical connection with the preceding chapters, they are manifestly out of place.

Moreover, as chap. xxv. 13 in the Hebrew reads, it has no legitimate connection either with that which goes before or with that which follows. In its present form it is altogether inappropriate, "because," as Bleek observes, "in the foregoing part of the book there are no threatening discourses whatever against heathen nations."[1] In the Septuagint, on the other hand, ver. 13 ends with the clause, "in this book." This term here, as elsewhere in Jeremiah, seems to be equivalent to a volume, or a collection of prophetic writings, of which the prophet wrote, or rather dictated, several; and it refers both to what immediately precedes and to what immediately succeeds. It is to be understood of the "book," or roll, which

[1] "Da im vorhergehenden Theile des Buches sich noch gar keine Drohreden wider fremde Völker finden." *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 326.

contained the prophecies against the "nations" mentioned in the section already discussed. In the Massoretic text, these prophecies are not included in this "book," but in another "book," or, perhaps, in what might have been a separate roll or volume.

Again, the section beginning with ver. 15 indicates that the prophecies properly belong where they stand in Greek. They form the natural connection between the two parts of this chapter, vers. 8–13 constituting a suitable introduction, and vers. 15–30 a suitable supplement. Their presence, too, is required here, not only by the general enumeration given in this latter section, but also by the special description it contains, that is, of the wine-cup of the divine fury. In the prophecy respecting Edom, chap. xlix. 12, where this same term occurs, the words are not an "echo" from ver. 28 of this section, as Hitzig suggests; but, with the prophecies in their right position, they form a faint outline in the former verse of a picture which in the latter verse appears in full. In the one case the figure is partially, in the other case completely, developed. From these considerations, it is evident that, in the Septuagint, these prophecies occupy their proper place.

Not only is this earlier position the one which, from their relation to the context, they would

naturally occupy, but also it is the one which they must have originally occupied in each text. That is, this is where they evidently stood in the originals of both the Hebrew and the Greek. That their position in the former was once the same as their position in the latter, is rendered practically certain by a critical comparison of the two texts. These prophecies at one time must have stood in the middle of the book, following immediately after chap. xxv. 13, because the sentence, "which Jeremiah hath prophesied against all the nations," occupies the same place in each text. In the Hebrew, though, it stands as the conclusion of ver. 13, while, in the Greek, it stands as the introduction to these nine prophecies. The sentence is not an appositional expression, as the Hebrew implies, but an introductory title, and has no direct relation to ver. 13. It simply connects the two parts of this "book," or roll. It should, moreover, be translated, "What (the things which) Jeremiah prophesied against the nations," and should be placed as a superscription to the prophecies, as it is found in the Septuagint translation. It, of course, as critics all agree, was not inserted here by Jeremiah, but by his secretary Baruch, or by an early editor, just as many, if not all, of the other superscriptions to chapters and paragraphs and prophecies were inserted.

This opinion receives the strongest possible support from Bleek, who regards the sentence in question as undoubtedly intended for a superscription in each text, and considers it appropriate where it stands only when, as in the Septuagint, it is followed by a series of utterances concerning foreign nations. After showing its unsuitableness as a title to the list of nations given in vers. 15–38, he says, "The maker of the Massoretic recension, however, who transplanted those other oracles against individual nations from here to the end of the book, has, as Movers also properly observes, misunderstandingly drawn the doubtful words to the context of the prophecy, together with the insertion of כל, and then also, for the purpose of connecting it with the foregoing, has placed at the beginning of ver. 14 a כי, which likewise did not originally stand there, and which the Septuagint does not express."[1] This explanation, though good so far as it goes, does not go far enough. As the whole of ver. 14 is wanting in the Septuagint, it, too, may have been inserted by

[1] "Der Urheber der masorethischen Recension aber, der jene anderen Orakel wider einzelne Völker von hier an den Schluss des Buches verpflanzte, hat (wie richtig auch Movers bemerkt) die fraglichen Worte missverständlich mit zum Contexte der Weissagung gezogen—mit Einschaltung von כל und dann auch v. 14 (am Anfange) zur Anknüpfung an das Vorhergehende ein כי gesetzt, was ursprünglich ebenfalls nicht dastand, und was die Septuaginta auch nicht ausdrückt." *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 326.

an ancient copyist or editor, in order to connect ver. 13 with ver. 15, after the prophecies, which the words in question originally introduced, had been removed. At any rate, the fact that the introductory sentence occupies exactly the same place in each text seems to prove that it is an ancient title, and not a "gloss," as Orelli[1] surprisingly asserts; and the additions mentioned by Bleek appear to indicate that ver. 13 in Hebrew was changed, and ver. 14 inserted, not through misunderstanding, but through intelligent design.

A further comparison of the two texts corroborates the probability of this conjecture. The omissions from the Septuagint in vers. 8–14 indicate that this section was once substantially the same in each text. The absence of "all," in the first member of ver. 9, Hitzig admits to be a better reading because of the singular, "that nation," in ver. 12, and "that land," in ver. 13. The clause, "and unto Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, my servant," in ver. 9, Graf himself regards as the addition of a later hand, as well as the clauses, "the king of Babylon . . . and the land of the Chaldeans," in ver. 12. The absence of the whole of ver. 14, which is unsuited to the context, is also in favour of the reading in the Septuagint. It appears unquestionably to have been either a gloss

[1] *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*, etc., Vierte Abteilung, p. 217.

or a marginal note. A literal rendering of vers. 11-13, as they now stand in the Greek, and as they once seem to have stood in the Hebrew, will illustrate the superiority of the Septuagint translation of the section under consideration. It will also show how appropriately this passage introduces the prophecies in question, and how admirably the reading of the version corresponds with the probabilities, so far as they can be estimated, and also with the facts, so far as they can be ascertained. The verses read, "And all the land (Judah) shall be a desolation, and they (the Jews) shall serve amongst the nations seventy years; and when the seventy years are accomplished (compare chap. xxix. 10), I will punish that nation (Babylonia), and I will make them (the Babylonians) a perpetual desolation; and I will bring upon that land (Babylonia) all my words which I have pronounced against it, even all that is written in this book."

Having shown that the position of these prophecies in the Septuagint is not only the proper one, but also the original one, even in the Massoretic text itself, it is worth observing that this position corresponds to that of similar prophecies in other Old Testament books. The analogy, as has already been admitted, possesses no special argumentative importance, but it is interesting, to

say the least. Concerning the different positions and the respective claims of each to originality, Kühl significantly says, "In the other great prophets, Ezekiel and Isaiah, the prophecies against the heathen stand in the middle, between penal and expostulatory discourses to the particular people and Messianic predictions of the future. In like manner, we could, with perfect right, expect them here also in the middle. Now we even actually find in chap. xxv. an enumeration of the nations, to whom the prophet, at the command of Jehovah, should reach forth the wine-cup of the divine fury; and the number and names of these nations substantially correspond with the nations against which the prophecies in chaps. xlvi.–xlix. (li.) are directed. If one reads chap. xxv., there really remains something missing; one seeks even here the presentation of the prophecies, such as chaps. xlvi.-xlix. (li.)." [1]

[1] "In den andern grossen Propheten, Ezechiel und Jesaja, stehen die Weissagungen gegen die Heiden in der Mitte zwischen Straf- und Mahnreden an das eigene Volk und messianischen Zukunftsweissagungen. Wir könnten sie also mit Fug und Recht hier auch in der Mitte erwarten. Nun finden wir auch wirklich in Kap. xxv. eine Aufzählung der Völker, denen der Prophet auf Jahwes Geheiss den Becher des Gotteszornes reichen soll; und die Anzahl und Namen dieser Völker stimmen im Wesentlichen überein mit den Völkern, gegen die sich die Weissagungen in Kap. xlvi.–xlix. (li.) richten. Liest man Kap. xxv., so bleibt wirklich etwas fehlen; man sucht die Ausführung der Weissagungen, also Kap. xlvi.–xlix. (li.), schon hier." *Das Verhältniss der Massora zur Septuaginta*, p. 15.

As this collection of prophecies forms in each text a connected whole, it is evident that the entire group has been, at some time, we know not when, by some one, we know not who, for some reason, we know not why, bodily transferred from one part to another part of the book. Their removal, moreover, was clearly intentional, and not accidental. The reason may have been to give precedence to the prophecies respecting the Jews, and thus to keep them separate, deeming "the end of the book the fitting place for them," as Streane suggests, "and by this position leaving the prophecies which had to do with the Jews themselves distinct and preceding them."[1] At all events, their arbitrary transposition was not the work of the Alexandrian translator, inasmuch as both the Hebrew and the Greek prove that, in the Septuagint, these prophecies occupy their proper and original place. The change was evidently made by a later editor or copyist in the Massoretic recension or text itself.

On this point, Scholz, in discussing the difference of arrangement which he with Bleek attributes to a subsequent reviser, forcefully observes, "That the alterations do not proceed from the translator appears from the character of his translation incon-

[1] *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, Jeremiah and Lamentations, Introduction, p. xxxvi.

testable. It is unthinkable that he should have made such great changes, while he not merely, with tolerable accuracy, translates from word to word, but even renders sentences in which he can find no sense, writes Hebrew words, whose meaning he does not know, with Greek letters, without translating them, and so forth. The words, 'And I will bring upon that land all my words which I have pronounced against it, even all that is written in *this book,'* ver. 13, also speak decidedly for this, that the prophecies against the nations formerly stood here, and, indeed, so much the more, as the words, 'and the king of Sheshach shall drink after them,' etc., ver. 26, are certainly spurious; so that, thus, in the prophecy, xxv. 14–38, respecting the land concerning which, according to ver. 13, the discourse must chiefly be, not a syllable stood in '*this book.*' Hence it follows that the arrangement of the book in six great divisions (Dekaden) is in the Septuagint alone correct."[1]

[1] "Dass die Aenderungen nicht vom Uebersetzer herrühren, geht aus dem Charakter seiner Uebersetzung umwidersprechlich hervor. Es ist undenkbar, dass derselbe, während er nicht nur mit ziemlicher Genauigkeit von Wort zu Wort übersetzt, selbst Sätze, in denen er keinen Sinn finden kann, widergibt, hebräische Wörter, deren Bedeutung er nicht kennt, mit griechischen Buchstaben, ohne sie zu übersetzen, schreibt u. s. w., so grosse Aenderungen sollte gemacht haben. Auch sprechen die Worte, v. 13, 'Et adducam super terram illam omnia verba mea, quæ locutus sum contra eam, omne, quod scriptum est in *libro isto,*' entschieden dafür, dass die Weissagungen gegen die Völker ehemals hier standen, und zwar um so

Notwithstanding the convincing character of the evidence respecting the ancient position of these prophecies, it is remarkable that in the latest commentary on this book of any critical importance, Orelli asserts, not only that the place they occupy in the Septuagint is not the more correct, but also that it is not their primitive position. He considers that their insertion after chap. xxv. 13 awkwardly cuts this chapter into two pieces. He admits, though, that their position in the Massoretic text is not the original one. "In the earliest editions of the book," he says, "most of the declarations respecting foreigners, which now stand at the end of it, must have stood in the immediate neighbourhood of chap. xxv."[1] He is disposed to believe that they formerly followed immediately after this chapter. Kuenen, who has long advocated this latter position, also admits that "with chap. xxv., particularly with vers. 15–26, the first group of prophecies against the heathen is certainly

mehr, als die Worte, v. 26, 'et rex Sesach bibet post eos,' u. s. w. sicher unächt sind, so dass also in der Weissagung, xxv. 14–38, von dem Lande, von dem nach v. 13 hauptsächlich die Rede sein müsste, in dem *libro isto* keine Sylbe stünde. Hiezu kommt, dass die Einrichtung des Buches in 6 Dekaden nur bei LXX. richtig ist." *Der masoreth. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung*, etc., p. 156.

[1] "In den frühesten Ausgaben des Buches die meisten jetzt an seinem Schluss befindlichen Sprüche über die Auswärtigen sich in unmittelbarer Nähe von c. 25 befunden haben müssen." *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*, etc., Vierte Abteilung, p. 217.

connected."[1] Ewald and Kühl, it is worth noting further in this connection, both make the same admission respecting their position in the Hebrew, but the former supposes that they stood originally just before chap. xxv., because he thinks the words, "these nations," ver. 9, indicate this place, while the latter supposes that they once stood just after ver. 29, because he thinks the rest of the chapter constitutes a kind of recapitulation of the entire group.

In answer to Kühl, it should be pointed out that vers. 30–38 form a natural conclusion to chap. xxv., as it now stands, but that they would not follow naturally after the group of prophecies, as he suggests. It would be neither natural nor appropriate to say, "Therefore prophesy thou against them all these words," etc., just after the prophecies had already been delivered. In answer to Ewald, it should be remarked that the two words, "these nations," imply no such position of these prophecies as he proposes, even though they both were genuine. The pronoun, "these," however, is not only superfluous, as Hitzig says, but is also wanting in the Septuagint, in which the reading, "all the nations round about it," is, as Hitzig likewise says, indisputably preferable.

[1] "Met H. xxv., bepaaldelijk met vs. 15–26, haugt de eerste groep der profetiën tegen de heidenen stellig zamen." *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek*, etc., Tweede Deel, 1863, p. 218.

In reply to all of these four critics, each of whom suggests for these nine prophecies a position other than that which they now occupy in either of the texts, it is sufficient to observe that, whereas the prophecies might stand tolerably well, perhaps, just after chap. xxv., as Ewald and Orelli both believe, there are only two positions legitimately under consideration in the discussion of this subject. We are concerned at present with two, and only two, textual authorities. The question is, Which one of these preserves the original position in the ancient text-recensions by means of which they have been individually handed down to us? From this investigation, it is manifest that the position in the Septuagint is the earlier and the more original of the two; that is, it is the most original of which there is at present any record. There is not a vestige of evidence to show that the prophecies ever occupied other than one of two positions in either the Palestinean or the Alexandrian recension; and the form of chap. xxv., and of ver. 13 especially, clearly indicates that they now should stand in the middle of that chapter, and that they once did stand there in each recension. If the position in the Septuagint, therefore, does not represent the prophet's own arrangement, it certainly indicates the form in which his writings were originally arranged.

Coming now to the discussion of the second question, it is also necessary to consider the correctness and the originality of the order of sequence of these prophecies amongst themselves. Judging the matter from circumstantial considerations, Graf maintains that the order in the Hebrew text is the more natural. He says, "The succession in which these nations are mentioned is such as most naturally follows from the situation and the circumstances. Egypt appears first, because from the defeat of her forces, described in chap. xlvi. 3–12, the disaster, indeed, proceeded to the other nations; then comes Philistia, which bordered alike on Egypt and on Judah; and the three countries which lay immediately on the other side, Moab and Ammon, the ever-united kindred nations, and Edom, the kindred nation of Judah; then Syria, which bordered on Israel, and which once stood in such manifold relations to it; finally, the Arabian tribes which dwelt away as far as the Euphrates."[1]

[1] "Die Reihenfolge, in welcher diese Völker aufgeführt werden, ist so wie sie sich aus Lage und Umständen am natürlichsten ergab: Aegypten erscheint zuerst, denn von der xlvi. 3–12 geschilderten Niederlage seiner Kriegsmacht ging ja das Unglück über die andern Völker aus, dann kommt Philistäa, welches zugleich an Aegypten und an Juda grenzte, und die drei Länder, welche auf der andern Seite zunächst lagen, Moab und Ammon, die stets verbundenen Brudervölker, und Edom, das Brudervolk Juda's, dann das an Israel grenzende und mit diesem einst in so vielfachen Beziehungen stehende Syrien, endlich die bis nach dem Euphrat hin wohnenden arabischen Stämme." *Der Prophet Jeremia*, p. 506.

There is something interesting, it must be admitted, in the order of these prophecies in the Hebrew, proceeding, as it does, to some extent, from the countries near to Palestine to those which are more distant from it; but this principle is not, by any means, consistently observed. A certain geographical arrangement, too, is traceable, though it is not very definite or distinct. In general, its course is from the south toward the north and east, but this direction is not followed with sufficient accuracy to possess any very great significance. Indeed, the principle which underlies the grouping in either text is far from obvious, and cannot be with certainty determined. When Graf asserts, however, that the order in the Hebrew follows most naturally from all the circumstances, his assertion is too sweeping by a good deal. After the prophecies had been fulfilled, the order might be regarded as more natural, perhaps; but, from chap. xxv. 13, one might most naturally expect the prophecy against Babylon to come first. It does not occupy this position, though, in either of the texts. In the Greek, it stands in the third place of the group, coming immediately after the prophecy against Egypt; in the Hebrew, it stands at the very end of the group. Streane considers that it is more natural to begin with Egypt, because this was "the nation whose overthrow by Nebu-

chadnezzar would be the signal to the rest of a similar fate."[1] This prophecy, however, would not necessarily be so understood until after the events predicted had transpired.

Graf also considers that the order of these prophecies in Hebrew is suited both to their subject-matter and to their time of composition.[2] The first assertion is possibly correct; the second assertion is probably incorrect. While the order in chaps. xlvi.–li. agrees in general with the enumeration which is given in chap. xxv. 15–26, the succession of the prophecies against Moab, Ammon and Edom in this latter chapter is inverted. This enumeration of nations, however, does not in each text exactly correspond. The Septuagint, besides omitting "and all the kings of the land of Uz," ver. 20; "the isle," ver. 22; "and all the kings of Arabia," ver. 24; "and all the kings of Zimri," ver. 25; "and the king of Sheshach shall drink after them," ver. 26, reads "Roz" for "Buz," ver. 23; "Persians" for "Medes," and "all the kings of the East" for "all the kings of the North," ver. 26. Thus, while the Hebrew order fairly suits the subject-matter in the Massoretic text, it does not specially suit the subject-matter in

[1] *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, Jeremiah and Lamentations, p. 284.

[2] *Der Prophet Jeremia*, Einleitung, p. li.

the Alexandrian text. That this order agrees with the time of the composition of these prophecies is neither certain nor probable. It is not certain, inasmuch as there are no historic data available for purposes of proof; it is not probable, inasmuch as the prophecy against Babylon can hardly have been spoken at a later period than any of the rest. Instead of having been composed last, one would naturally expect from chap. xxv. 8–12 that it would have been composed first. The exact time, however, of the composition of the respective prophecies cannot be absolutely shown.

The prophecies in the Greek, Graf further says, have been quite arbitrarily transposed by an application to them of later circumstances. This assertion is even more groundless than either of the two preceding ones. There is not the slightest reason for supposing that the ancient order in the Greek was ever intentionally changed. That a prophecy may have been accidentally misplaced is possible, perhaps, although there is no conclusive evidence that this is really the case. In the Hebrew, on the other hand, not only is there considerable reason for supposing that the order has been changed, but also there is substantial evidence of such a change. The Hebrew order has the appearance of having been altered, partly with reference to the enumeration of nations in chap. xxv.

15–26, and partly with reference to the supposed order of fulfilment of the prophecies. The position of the prophecy against Babylon is an indication that it must have been inserted purposely in this place by some one after the events predicted had already taken place. Further evidence of this assertion is furnished by the fact that the statement, "and the king of Sheshach shall drink after them," chap. xxv. 26, is unquestionably spurious. It is plainly an interpolation having no legitimate connection where it stands. It seems, as Bleek believes, and as Graf himself admits, to have been added by a later hand with reference to the position of the prophecy respecting Babylon, which appears in Hebrew as chaps. l., li. The whole sentence is wanting in the Septuagint, as well as the word "Sheshach" also in chap. li. 41. This latter term, moreover, cannot have proceeded from Jeremiah, as Hitzig says, because, as he justly adds, the prophet had no reason whatever to employ such a form of cabalistic writing.

While there is no probability that the order in the Greek has been "arbitrarily transposed," as Graf asserts, and while there is great probability that the order in the Hebrew has been purposely arranged according to a principle, partly geographical, partly chronological, the absolute correctness of the one or of the other is difficult, if not impos-

sible, to determine. Inasmuch as the Hebrew has been evidently altered, there is good reason to regard the order in the Greek as the more correct. What the principle underlying the order in the Septuagint may have been, however, is by no means clear. Scholz, though, offers a suggestion which, if not convincing, is at least ingenious. He says, "Why does the short utterance respecting Elam, which certainly had long since ceased to play an important part, stand at the very beginning? Possibly, because the first exploit of the ancestor of Israel was performed against an Elamite (Gen. xiv.). The second World-wide Power with which Israel came into hostile relations is Egypt, and the third is Babylon—the last as the inheritress of Nineveh. Thus were the utterances respecting the three great nations first brought into chronological order."[1]

The question of the priority of the order of sequence in each text is also difficult to decide with certainty. As the succession in the Septua-

[1] "Warum steht der kleine Ausspruch über Aelam, das zudem längst aufgehört hatte, eine entscheidende Rolle zu spielen, voran? Etwa, weil die erste That des Stammvaters Israels gegen einen Alamiten gerichtet ist Gen. xiv.? Die zweite Weltmacht, mit der Israel feindlich zusammentraf, ist Aegypten, die dritte Babel, letzteres zugleich als Erbin Ninive's. So wurden zuerst die Aussprüche über die grossen Völker in chronologischer Ordnung gebracht." *Der masoreth. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung*, etc., p. 157.

gint appears to be the more correct, so also, with greater reason, it appears to be the more primitive. Whether this arrangement indicates the order of the composition of each particular prophecy or not, it seems to indicate the original order of its publication in manuscript form. The exact period of the composition of each, however, is not definitely known and cannot be definitely determined. The small amount of accurate historical information which we possess respecting these ancient times renders the determination of the date of many, if not most, of them absolutely impossible. According to the list of nations, chap. xxv. 15–26, one would naturally expect, if the order in this section had any real significance, that the prophecy against Egypt should stand first in the collection, and that against Elam last. Instead of this being the case, Elam begins the group. Hence it is evident that the arrangement in the Greek was not determined with reference to this enumeration. It is reasonable, therefore, to believe that this was its original place in the collection. The translator gave, one must assume, the order which obtained in the ancient manuscript which he used. Had he found the succession in chap. xxv. 15–26 reproduced, he surely would have followed it. The great age of the Septuagint, and the circumstances under which the translation was made, all point to the

conclusion that it presents, as nearly as can be known, the primitive order of sequence of these prophecies amongst themselves.

It is significant, though, that at the end of the prophecy against Elam and at the commencement of chap. xxvi. in the Septuagint, it is stated that this prophecy was composed in the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah. This statement shows that the order of the prophecies in the Alexandrian version was not made to harmonize with the time of their respective composition, inasmuch as one of them, at least, must have been composed earlier than the reign of Zedekiah, if the date of the prophecy against Egypt be correct. As both the Hebrew and the Greek agree in reference to this date, there is reason to regard it as authentic. This latter prophecy was probably read to king Jehoiakim, and was certainly delivered before the time of Pharaoh-Necho's disastrous overthrow at Carchemish. Disregarding this date, Scholz, who defends the Alexandrian order, supposes that the prophecy against Elam was "composed earlier than any other;" and Kühl, who defends the Massoretic order, asserts that it was "written later than the rest." The record of the first date seems to be an explanatory note which formerly stood in the margin of the ancient manuscripts. In that case it was probably, at a time prior to

the translation of the Septuagint, inserted in the text as a chronological subscription, because of the unexpected place which this prophecy occupied in the ancient collection.

If this supposition be correct, the marginal note, or the chronological subscription, whichever it may be, affords important evidence of the originality of the order in the Septuagint. However the historic statement may be explained, it apparently indicates the primitive position of this particular prophecy. Scholz's discussion of this question is worthy of consideration. "That the prophecy against Elam stands in the original place appears, in the highest degree, probable," he says, "through this, that the Greek text here displays an indubitably primitive peculiarity. The prophecy against Elam has in connection with it, and, indeed, *alone in the whole book, a subscription:* 'In the beginning of the reigning of king Zedekiah was this word concerning Elam.' It is quite incredible that a reviser of the present Massoretic text, for instance, should have hit upon the thought of converting here for the only time, against the usage of the entire book, as well as against his own custom, a superscription into a subscription; while, on the contrary, it is perfectly explicable how a reviser may have held it in order to remove this peculiarity by

placing the subscription at the beginning of a section."[1]

Moreover, as the name of Babylon does not appear in the list of nations given in chap. xxv. 15–26, being rightly wanting, as has been pointed out, the transposition of three of the prophecies, namely, those respecting Elam, Moab and Damascus, leaving the prophecy respecting Babylon where it stands in Greek, would make the order of sequence of the prophecies amongst themselves harmonize in general with the above-mentioned enumeration. The change might have been made easily and with very little trouble, if the translator had been disposed to tamper with his text. For the reason that he did not make this change, it is quite improbable that the divergent order of the prophecies was due, in any sense, to intention on his part. The originality of the arrangement in the Septuagint is further indicated by the fact

[1] "Dass die Weissagung gegen Aelam bei LXX. an ursprünglicher Stelle steht, wird höchst wahrscheinlich dadurch, dass der griechische Text hier eine unzweifelhaft ursprüngliche Eigenthümlichkeit zeigt. Die Weissagung gegen Aelam hat bei ihnen und zwar *allein im ganzen Buche eine Unterschrift:* Ἐν ἀρχῇ βασιλεύοντος Σεδεκίου βασιλέως ἐγένετο ὁ λόγος οὗτος περὶ Αἰλάμ. Es ist ganz unglaublich, dass z. B. ein Bearbeiter des jetzigen masorethischen Textes auf den Einfall sollte gekommen sein, gegen den Gebrauch des ganzen Buches und seinen eigenen hier das einzige Mal eine Ueberschrift in eine Unterschrift zu verwandeln, während es umgekehrt vollkommen erklärlich ist, wie ein Diaskeuast es für in Ordnung gehalten habe, diese Unregelmässigkeit dadurch zu beseitigen, dass er die Unterschrift an den Anfang des Stückes stellte." *Der masoreth. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung*, etc., p. 157.

that it is entirely independent of any principle either of geographical position or of prophetical fulfilment. On this point Scholz again significantly observes, "Finally, there speaks directly for the Septuagint the circumstance, that the regulating principle in the Massoretic text, which is plainly conformable to chap. xxv. 14 *seq.*, is manifest, while in the Septuagint it is, at least, obscure. But now how could it happen that any one should set aside what was clear and also, on superficial reading, easy to understand, and put in its place what even to himself was unintelligible?! So much the more, as to put the separate pieces in another place, instead of following the simple copy, could not be done without trouble. Whereas, how easily, especially if the translator had been 'inconsiderate and superficial,' could, in some way, a short prophecy, for instance, against Damascus have fallen out! Likewise, moreover, do preponderating reasons also speak for the originality of the order of the prophecies in the Septuagint."[1]

Thus the investigation of the position, and also

[1] "Endlich spricht für LXX. gerade der Umstand, dass das ordnende Princip bei dem masorethischen Texte sichtlich dem cap. xxv. 14 ff. conform, klar, bei LXX. aber mindestens unklar ist. Wie käme nun aber Jemand dazu, Klares und auch bei oberflächlichem Lesen leicht Erkennbares bei Seite zu legen, und ihm selbst Unverständliches an die Stelle zu setzen?! Um so mehr, als es nicht mühelos sein konnte, statt der einfachen Abschrift die einzelnen Stücke an anderer Stelle unterzubringen. Wie leicht konnte da,

of the order of the prophecies, leads to a similar conclusion. In each respect the Septuagint translation possesses the superiority. Of the correctness and originality of the position in the version, there can be no reasonable doubt; and, if the order in the latter be not the absolutely correct and original one, it is apparently and with great probability, the earlier one of the two. The order, moreover, is most likely the one which the Greek translator found before him in the manuscript he used. The justice of this conclusion appears to be unquestionable. Its reasonableness, it is believed, will be admitted by every unprejudiced investigator. Kuenen even, though he is generally against the Septuagint, honestly acknowledges the probability that the position in the Hebrew has been intentionally changed, as well as the improbability that either the position or the order in the Greek was changed by the translator. While believing that neither text exhibits the primitive form of the book in respect to these nine prophecies, he frankly says, "It does not follow from this that they have always stood, as in the Massoretic text, at the end of the entire collection;"

zumal wenn der Uebersetzer 'leichtfertig und oberflächlich' gewesen wäre, etwa eine kleine Weissagung z. B. gegen Damaskus ausfallen! So sprechen also auch überwiegende Gründe für die Ursprünglichkeit der Reihenfolge der Weissagungen bei LXX." *Der masoreth. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung*, etc., p. 158.

and he justly adds, "neither has it been proved that the Greek translator took the liberty of transposing and transplanting these prophecies."[1]

There is the clearest evidence that both the ancient position and the ancient order in the Massoretic text have been, at some time, arbitrarily changed. The transposition in each case was evidently made by a later editor or reviser after the events predicted had transpired. An impartial consideration of all the circumstances renders this conclusion practically certain. The reason for the change in each respect has been so clearly and forcibly stated by Bleek, that it is important in concluding this discussion to quote in full his very reasonable explanation. "Were the Massoretic recension," he says, "the more original, then it would be absolutely impossible to conceive how a later Alexandrian redactor, even if he gave the oracles in the book in general a position other than that in which he found them, should have happened also so to transpose the individual ones against each other, as they present themselves in the Septuagint, that he placed as the very first the oracle respecting Elam (which in the Massoretic text is the last but

[1] "Daaruit volgt echter nog niet, dat zij altijd, gelijk in de Masora, aan het einde der gansche verzameling hebben gestaan; . . . ook is het onbewezen, dat de Grieksche vertaler zich veroorloofd heeft, die godspraken om te zetten en te verplaatsen." *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek*, etc., Tweede Deel, p. 240.

one), and as the third the one respecting Babylon (which in the Massoretic text is the last of all), and so forth. Much sooner, on the contrary, can one imagine, if these oracles formerly had the position and the order which they have in the Septuagint, how the later redactor, who transferred them from that place to the end of the whole collection, could happen also to change their order of sequence amongst themselves. For as, a little while before, the immigration of the Jews with the prophet into Egypt was related, together with the prophecies respecting the destruction which would meet them there, such as those referring to the conquest of the country by Nebuchadnezzar and the fall of Pharaoh-Hophra, he (the redactor) might easily feel occasioned to place at the head of the group of prophecies respecting the individual heathen nations the two respecting Egypt, which at first stood after the one respecting Elam; and likewise he might find it suitable to place quite at the end the great oracle concerning the chief adversary of the covenant-people, namely, the Chaldeans, which followed immediately after those concerning Egypt. By this means, though, no doubt, the displacement of the position of the whole of these prophecies was naturally and easily brought about."[1]

[1] "Wäre die masorethische Recension die ursprünglichere, so würde sich durchaus nicht begreifen lassen, wie ein späterer Alexan-

The transposition of chapters, which was owing to the bodily removal of the prophecies against the heathen nations from the middle to the end of the book, as shown by the foregoing investigation, furnishes no real evidence of different text-recensions. The transposition of verses, owing to the arbitrary rearrangement of these prophecies amongst themselves, also affords no certain evidence of a special text-recension. The two texts, so far as the general position and arrangement of these prophecies are concerned, were probably at one time substantially, if not identically, the same. There are, how-

drinischer Redactor, wenn er auch diesen Orakeln im Allgemeinen im Buche eine andere Stellung gab, als worin er sie vorfand, sollte dazu gekommen sein, auch die einzelnen gegen einander so umzustellen, wie sie in der Sept. sich finden, dass er das Orakel über Elam (im masorethischen Texte das vorletzte) zuvörderst stellte, das über Babel (im masorethischen Texte das letzte) als das dritte, u. s. w. Weit eher kann man sich dagegen denken, wenn diese Orakel früher die Stellung und Reihenfolge wie in der Sept. hatten, wie der spätere Redactor, der sie von dort an das Ende der ganzen Sammlung stellte, dazu kommen konnte, auch ihre Aufeinanderfolge zu ändern. Denn da kurz vorher die Einwanderung der Juden mit dem Propheten in Aegypten erzählt war, mit Weissagungen über das Verderben, welches sie dort treffen werde, sowie über die Eroberung des Landes durch Nebukadnezar und den Untergang des Pharao Hophra, so konnte er leicht veranlasst werden, von der Sammlung der Orakel über die einzelnen fremden Völker die beiden über Aegypten, welche erst hinter dem über Elam standen, an die Spitze zu stellen; und ebenso konnte er es angemessen finden, das grosse Orakel über den Hauptwidersacher des Bundesvolkes, über die Chaldäer, welches unmittelbar auf die über Aegypten folgte, ganz an den Schluss zu stellen. Dadurch schon aber wurde von selbst und leicht eine Verrückung der Stellung dieser sämmtlichen Orakel herbeigeführt." *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 325.

ever, a few instances of versé-transposition, namely, chaps. x. 5–9; xxiii. 7, 8; xxxi. 35–37, which apparently indicate recensional divergences. In the latter example, the order of the verses is 37, 35, 36. The transposition, though unimportant in itself, appears to be recensional, because of a number of minor but significant variations in these verses. In each of the former examples, the transposition is so important that it requires a more complete discussion.

In the Alexandrian version, chap. x., ver. 5 follows ver. 9, which, vers. 6, 7, 8 being omitted from the Greek, comes immediately after ver. 4. Ver. 9 has really no legitimate connection with ver. 8, but is grammatically connected with ver. 4, being manifestly the continuation from this latter verse of the detailed description of an idol, begun in ver. 3 and completed in ver. 5. A close comparison of the two texts shows that, in this passage, the construction of the Greek is much more natural than that of the Hebrew, which seems to have been considerably glossed, vers. 6, 7, 8 being probably interpolations. A careful study of the section also shows that the description in vers. 3, 4 is violently interrupted by the insertion of the interpolated verses; that ver. 9 should stand directly after ver. 4, and that ver. 5 should follow ver. 9, because it forms a logical conclusion to the whole account.

Its position in the Septuagint is not simply the preferable one, it is the only proper one. The transposition of this verse, if not actually due to textual divergency, was likely due either to interpolation or to displacement in the Massoretic text.

In chap. xxiii. again, vers. 7, 8 stand in the Septuagint at the very end of it, immediately after ver. 40. These verses are a substantial repetition of chap. xvi. 14, 15; and it will be observed that in this latter place in each text they follow words of threatening or warning, just as they follow such words in the present place in Greek. It was customary with the prophet, in delivering his solemn messages, to mingle encouragement with reproof, as may be seen by referring to chaps. iv. 27; v. 10, 18; xxvii. 22. For this reason, their later position here in Greek is perfectly appropriate. Their earlier position here in Hebrew may have been due to their arbitrary insertion by some one in order to connect the promise of a national restoration with that of a national deliverer, and thereby to foster Messianic hopes and expectations. Either these verses were removed from the end of the chapter, and inserted after ver. 6, as suggested, or the difference of arrangement was recensional. In any case, as Graf and Hitzig both admit, because of the peculiar connection between ver. 6 and ver. 9 in Greek, their changed position was not due to

the translator. He did not find them where they now appear in Hebrew in his manuscript.

The transposition of words, on the other hand, of which there are examples scattered throughout the entire book, evidently indicates a twofold text-recension. Transpositions of this kind occur in nearly every chapter, from one to four and five examples in a single chapter being sometimes found. Their nature, as well as their number, shows that they belonged to the translator's text. The most, if not the whole, of them must have been recensional. They cannot have been either accidental or intentional. In some cases, the frequency, in other cases, the nature, of the transpositions is a proof of their recensional character. Such instances are, "saith the Lord," chaps. i. 19; iii. 16; v. 11; xiii. 14; xix. 12; xxxi. 37; xlviii. 38; "from the Lord," chaps. xi. 1; xviii. 1; xxi. 1; xxxii. 1; xl. 1; "the priest" and "the prophet," chaps. vi. 13; xiv. 18; xxiii. 11, 33; "sword," chaps. xiv. 16; xxi. 7; xxiv. 10; "the priests," chaps. xxvii. 16; xxviii. 5; "evil," chaps. vi. 19; xix. 3; "behold," chaps. vii. 11; xxiii. 30; "the beasts of the earth," chaps. xv. 3; xvi. 4; "gladness" and "mirth," chaps. xvi. 9; xxv. 10; "the Lord," chap. li. 12, 56; "to a stock," chap. ii. 27; "I have purposed it," chap. iv. 28; "murder,"

"commit adultery" and "steal," chap. vii. 9; "the herbs," chap. xii. 4; "I will cause them to know," chap. xvi. 21; "far" and "near," chap. xxv. 26.

There are many cases in which it is impossible to tell which order of the words transposed is the earlier or the more original. The one is practically as good as the other, and the one is just as likely as the other to be correct: as, for instance, "backsliding" and "wickedness," chap. ii. 19; "seed," chap. ii. 21; "saying," chap. ii. 27; "if," chap. ii. 28; "no more," chap. ii. 31; "bride" and "maid," chap. ii. 32; "stocks" and "stones," chap. iii. 9; "the prophets," chap. iv. 9; "not at all," chap. vi. 15; "bride" and "bridegroom," chap. vii. 34; "they shall be," chap. viii. 2; "summer" and "harvest," chap. viii. 20; "hammers," chap. x. 4; "any more," chap. x. 20; "day," chap. xiv. 17; "O Lord," chap. xiv. 22; "this people," chap. xv. 1; "brazen," chap. xv. 20; "out of the womb," chap. xx. 18; "unto them," chap. xxi. 3; "great," chap. xxii. 8; "well with *thee*," chap. xxii. 15; "the smiths," chap. xxix. 2; "peace," chap. xxix. 7; "words," chap. xxix. 23; "that maketh himself a prophet" and "is mad," chap. xxix. 26; "the Lord," chap. xxxi. 3; "flock," chap. xxxi. 12; "to Babylon," chap. xxxii. 5; "that is in Anathoth," chap.

xxxii. 8; "fields," chap. xxxii. 15; "way" and "heart," chap. xxxii. 39; "honey," chap. xli. 8; "unto Jeremiah the prophet," chap. xlii. 2; "to deliver" and "to save," chap. xlii. 11; "there," chap. xlii. 15; "an astonishment and a curse," chap. xliv. 12; "daughter," chap. xlviii. 18; "the snare," chap. xlviii. 43; "a fear," chap. xlix. 5; "evil tidings," chap. xlix. 23; "in the land," chap. l. 22; "and thou art also taken," chap. l. 24; "habitation," chap. l. 45; "the trumpet," chap. li. 27; "and all the land," chap. li. 28; "Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon," chap. li. 34; "Babylon," chap. li. 41; "five cubits," chap. lii. 22; "continually," chap. lii. 33.

It is unreasonable to suppose that all these transpositions of words, amounting to nearly ninety cases, were arbitrarily made by the translator. They were most likely textual peculiarities. This likelihood amounts to a certainty where several examples of the same sort occur. The one order of words belonged to the original of the Greek, the other to the original of the Hebrew. An occasional example may, of course, in each text have been accidental. The position, though, of "saith the Lord," chap. i. 19, in the Septuagint is the proper one, and is the same as that in the Hebrew, chap. xv. 20, and also as that in both the Hebrew and the Greek, chap. i. 8. The order of the transposed

words in the Greek, chaps. ii. 27; xii. 4, is more poetical than the order in the Hebrew. While the words "priest" and "prophet" are transposed in several passages, the order "prophet" and "priest" occurs in Greek, chap. xxiii. 34. The parellelism is improved by the transposition in the Septuagint, chaps. iv. 28; xvi. 21.

The Greek order, it will be seen, of "murder," "commit adultery," and "steal," chap. vii. 9, corresponds with the order of the commandments in the Decalogue, Exod. xx. 13, 14, 15; Deut. v. 17, 18, 19. The Greek position of "the priests," chaps. xxvii. 16; xxviii. 5, is evidently recensional, as the two passages are so similar and stand so near to each other. The Greek order of "the beasts of the earth," chaps. xv. 3; xvi. 4, is shown to be recensional, partly for the same reason, and partly for the reason that the Greek and the Hebrew order of these words, chap. vii. 33, is just the same. The Greek order of the transposed words, chap. xxv. 26, is exactly like the Hebrew order, chap. xlviii. 24. The frequent occurrence of "from the Lord," always in a superscription, and also of "the priest" and "the prophet," always in a similar construction, proves these transpositions to have been recensional. Certain verbal combinations, though common, are not uniform in either text, as has been shown by

the discussion of the group of words, "sword, famine, and pestilence."

The transpositions of letters are also worthy of consideration. Some of them are significant, as possibly indicating recensional divergences; others of them are important, as probably representing superior readings in the Septuagint; all of them are interesting, as plainly showing the origin of a considerable number of variations. While this species of transposition cannot be employed to prove the present hypothesis, it is not at all improbable that some examples were due to different text-recensions, although, of course, it is impossible to point out instances with certainty. Some of these divergences apparently arose from transcription, others of them from dictation. As the transposition may as easily and as likely have taken place in copying or dictating the original of the Hebrew as in copying or dictating the original of the Greek, it cannot be determined now in which recension the variation first occurred, except in so far as the context proves the reading in the one case or the other to be right.

In certain cases, it ought to be observed, the transposition does not seriously affect the sense, the rendering in each text being equally admissible; in many cases, the reading in the Hebrew is superior; in other cases, the reading in the Greek

is not simply preferable but correct. Such examples in the Septuagint are "destroyed" for "burned up," chap. ii. 15, which better suits the context; "burned" for "broken down," chap. iv. 26, which corresponds with chaps. xlix. 2; li. 58; "be consumed" for "shall die," chaps. xi. 22; xlii. 17, 22, which corresponds with chaps. xiv. 15; xliv. 12; "in his forest" for "in his cities," chap. l. 32, which agrees with chap. xxi. 14, and which, as Hitzig says, is required by the sense.

As their number is considerable, it is unnecessary to examine each of them in detail. Scholars can make the examination for themselves. Their chief significance consists, partly in showing how many divergences arose, and partly in showing how the Septuagint translation may be used for purposes of text-criticism. The following examples occur:—

נִתְּצוּ—נִצְּתָה, ii. 15; לְמוֹקֵשׁ—מַלְקוֹשׁ, iii. 3; נִתְּצוּ—
נִצְּתוּ, iv. 26; נִלְאוּ—נוֹאֲלוּ, v. 4; נִהְיָה—הַנָּוָה, vi. 2;
מָשְׁחָתִים—מַשְׁחִיתִם, vi. 28; צוֹרֵף—צָרוֹף, vi. 29;
אַחֲרוֹן—אֹרְחִים, ix. 1; נִתְּצוּ—נִצְּתוּ, ix. 9; וּבָא—
יָבוֹא, x. 9; יִתַּמּוּ—יָמֻתוּ, xi. 22; אָרְחֹתֵינוּ—אַחֲרִיתֵנוּ,
xii. 4; מִנְאָצַי—נִמְצְאוּ, xv. 16; עָמֹק—עָקֹב, xvii. 9;
וְהַשְׂכֵּל—יִכָּשְׁלוּ, xx. 11; וְהָרְחָם—וְרַחְמָהּ, xx. 17;
עֹשְׁקוֹ—עוֹשֵׁק, xxi. 12; עֹשְׁקוֹ—עָשׁוֹק, xxii. 3;
נֶאֱנַחְתְּ—נֵחַנְתְּ, xxii. 23; שׁוּב—שָׁבוּ, xxiii. 14; הוֹי—

הָיָה, xxx. 7; נָשָׂאתִי—אָנוּשׁ, xxx. 12; יֹאכֵלוּ—יֵלֵכוּ (?), xxx. 16; יִרְמוּ—יִמַּדּוּ (?), וְיֵרָחֵק—וְיֵחָקְרוּ, xxxi. 37; יִסָּפְדוּ—יִשָּׂרְפוּ, xxxiv. 5; (הָ)אָרֶץ—הָאוֹצָר, xxxviii. 11; יִתַּמּוּ—יָמוּתוּ, xlii. 17; תִּתָּמּוּ—תָּמוּתוּ, xlii. 22; מַעֲשֶׂיהָ—הוֹשִׁיעָה, xliii. 2; לְהָרַע—לְרָעָה, xliv. 27; קוֹלֵךְ—קְלוֹנֵךְ, xlvi. 12; עִירָהּ—עָרֶיהָ, xlviii. 15; בִּצְרָתֵךְ—בְּצִירֵךְ, xlviii. 32; יָדָם—דַּיָּם, xlix. 9; חָשַׂפְתִּי—שָׁחַפְתִּי or סָחַבְתִּי, xlix. 10; נְשָׂאֵם—נֶאְשָׁם (?), l. 7; מְעָרָה—עֲרֵמִים, l. 26; בְּיַעֲרוֹ—בְּעָרָיו, l. 32; הוֹי—הָיוּ, li. 2; בְּעֵבֶר—בְּעַרְבוֹת, lii. 8.

CHAPTER V.

THE VARIATIONS—ALTERATIONS.

THE nature of the Alterations, which are very numerous, is of the greatest possible importance. The evidence they furnish is really sufficient of itself to establish the present hypothesis. No other kind of evidence can be more significant for proving the existence of special text-recensions. This class of variation cannot have been due either to accident or to design. It is more reasonable to suppose that the translator arbitrarily abridged his text by leaving out unnecessary and unimportant matter, although this latter supposition is foundationless, than to suppose that he arbitrarily altered the grammatical forms he found before him, and that to an extent which, more or less, in multitudes of cases, affects the understanding of the text. A certain license of translation he undoubtedly possessed. When the construction of the Greek required, or properly permitted, a slight change of form that would not affect the meaning of a passage, then a change, of course, would be quite

justifiable; but when the genius of the language in no way called for such a change, then it would be altogether unjustifiable.

In nearly every case, however, the alterations that occur are entirely unnecessary on linguistic grounds. The translator could just as easily have reproduced the form in Hebrew as he could give the form in Greek. Besides, the rendering in the Greek in general is good, and represents an excellent Hebrew text. This would not have been the case had the translator been dishonest or incompetent. The supposed arbitrary character of this class of variation has not even the amount of plausibility that so many scholars seem to think belongs to the divergences that have already been discussed. For most of the alterations, which appear in all parts of the book, there was not the least necessity on any ground; and, consequently, for making them there was not the slightest excuse. The charge of arbitrariness respecting them, therefore, is as unreasonable as the practice of it would have been inexcusable.

Incredible as the supposition seems, it is remarkable, notwithstanding, that Graf attributes the alterations to the same unworthy cause as that to which he ascribes the omissions, the additions, and the transpositions. He deliberately asserts, "Of the arbitrariness of the translator, nearly every

verse bears witness; it is sufficient, therefore, to cite only some of the most striking examples of the different ways in which it manifests itself. Without regard to the grammatical forms of the text, and often quite contrary to sense and connection, person or number is changed."[1] He then indicates a number of illustrations, as he believes, of the translator's arbitrariness in each of these respects. Before presenting a complete classification of the different species of alteration that occur, it will be interesting to examine some of his examples.

Beginning with the instances he gives of change of person, it should be observed that the third person instead of the first in the second member of chap. ii. 25 does not at all affect the meaning of the verse. The Greek expresses the sense as accurately as the Hebrew expresses it; and, if both readings are not equally good, both, at least, are equally admissible. The second person instead of the third in the second sentence of ver. 30 of this same chapter is really required by the sense, inasmuch as the smiting of the children was designed, in the opinion of the prophet, to teach the parents

[1] "Von der Willkür des Uebersetzers legt fast jeder Vers Zeugniss ab, es genügt daher von den verschiedenen Weisen, in welchen sich dieselbe zeigt, nur einige der schlagendsten Beispiele anzuführen. Ohne Rücksicht auf die grammatischen Formen des Textes und oft ganz gegen Sinn und Zusammenhang wird Person oder Numerus geändert." Einleitung, p. lii.

wisdom. The second person of the pronouns in the succeeding sentence harmonizes with the second person of the verb in this sentence. A translation of it shows that the whole verse, as it stands in Greek, is admirable. The latter reads, "In vain have I smitten your children; *ye* have not received instruction: the sword hath devoured your prophets, like a destroying lion, *and ye have feared not.*" The added sentence, the change of person, and the omission of "your" before "sword," all afford convincing proof that the translator had another and a special text before him.

The second person instead of the first in the opening sentence of chap. viii. 6 is perfectly consistent with the context, as will appear from a literal translation of the first half of the verse in Greek. It should be rendered, "Hearken ye, now, and hear; not thus do (will) they speak, there is not a man repenting him of his wickedness, saying, What have I done?" The meaning given here is good, and the addition of the word "now," as well as the change of person and number, proves that the original of the Greek in this verse, too, was different from the original of the Hebrew. The second person instead of the first in the first member of chap. xxii. 14 is perfectly in harmony with the context in the Septuagint. In the latter, the words, "that saith," are wanting; and the verse

commences with a direct reference to Jehoiakim, the subject of the passage, "*Thou* hast built for *thyself* a wide (symmetrical) house," etc. The second person, moreover, as in Greek, agrees exactly with the beginning of the next verse in both Greek and Hebrew, which reads, "Shalt thou reign?" etc. The whole section, vers. 13–23, presents a number of divergences that point clearly to a special text-recension. The third person instead of the first in the last member of chap. xvi. 13 is not contrary to the meaning of the verse as it stands in Greek, the latter half of which may be correctly rendered, "and there shall ye serve other gods, *which* shall show you no favour." The adverbial clause, "day and night," is wanting in the Septuagint, but the sense expressed in Greek is excellent. This difference of reading is undoubtedly recensional.

Besides these alleged examples of wilful change of person, Graf gives some illustrations of what he believes to be a special kind of arbitrary alteration of person. In the Massoretic text, Jeremiah sometimes represents himself as suffering with the people concerning whom he prophesies, or as mourning in the person of that people. In the Alexandrian text, these personal lamentations, as a rule, do not appear. An examination of a number of such passages will prove that they did not appear in the translator's manuscript. The second

person instead of the first in both members of chap. x. 19 is shown to be a recensional divergence by the omission of "me" from this verse, by the continuation of the second person through the first member of ver. 20, by the addition of "it is destroyed" to the same member, and by the resumption of the first person in the second member of this latter verse. The similar changes of person in chaps. xiii. 17; xiv. 17; xlviii. 31, are all evidences of the same fact. In each of these three examples the rendering in the Septuagint suits the context. In the second example, the formula with which the verse begins properly introduces a divine address, and not a human lamentation, as is well illustrated by chap. xiii. 12. The Greek is thus superior to the Hebrew. That the two texts in chaps. xiv. 17; xlviii. 31, were originally different is further shown by the additions and omissions that occur in each of these two passages.

Graf's charges of wilful change of number on the part of the translator are no more reasonable than are those of wilful change of person. When his examples are subjected to a critical investigation, they illustrate the existence of another text in nearly every case. The plural for the singular in the second half of chap. iii. 6 is neither incorrect nor contrary to the sense. Although "Israel" is spoken of in the singular in the first member of

this verse, the collective plural is perfectly admissible in speaking of the conduct of the people individually. The word for "she" here is wanting in the Septuagint, and the word "backsliding," having been derived from another Hebrew root, is rendered "colony." In the Greek the verse reads, "Hast thou seen what the *colony* of Israel hath done *to me? they are* gone up upon every high mountain and under every green tree, and there *have* played the harlot." The sense expressed in Greek is quite as good as that expressed in Hebrew, but the original texts were slightly different. It is incredible that the translator should have added the words "to me," and have omitted the pronoun "she," and have changed the number of two principal verbs in a single member of one verse.

Neither is the singular for the plural in the first half of chap. xxii. 7 incorrect or contrary to the sense. The construction of the Greek is just as allowable as that of the Hebrew. The reading, "I will bring against thee *a destroying man* and his *weapon*," harmonizes perfectly with the context. The substitution of "bring" for "prepare," as well as the change of number, proves the existence of another text. The singular for the plural in the middle of ver. 26 of this same chapter is not merely not improper, but is even superior to the form in Hebrew. The verse in Greek reads, "And I will

cast thee out, and thy mother that bare thee, into *a* country, where *thou wast* not born, and there shall ye (thou and thy mother) die." The meaning expressed is preferable in the Septuagint, and the translator, doubtless, reproduced the text he had before him. He would not gratuitously have changed the number of a principal verb, and have omitted the word "another," which is possibly, as Hitzig thinks, a gloss, and which, at all events, is quite unnecessary.

The plural for the singular in the first half of chap. xxvi. 19 is quite as correct, and quite as consistent with the context, as the form in the Hebrew is. Indeed, the plural might most naturally be expected in this place. The reference is not confined to "Hezekiah" alone, but to the "king of Judah and all Judah," as the rendering of the Septuagint shows. The latter reads, "Did Hezekiah king of Judah and all Judah put him at all to death? did *they* not fear the Lord?" etc. The singular for the plural in the first half of chap. xxxii. 36 is perfectly appropriate. The reference in the Septuagint here is to the prophet, and the form, "whereof *thou sayest*," is just the same as that in the corresponding part of ver. 43 in Greek. A further evidence that these divergences are recensional is furnished by the fact that, in a similar account, chap. xxxiii. 10, the plural form,

"whereof ye say," is found in both the Hebrew and the Greek.

The singular for the plural in the first half of chap. l. 42 is another illustration of recensional divergency. Instead of the verb "hold" here, the Septuagint has the participle "having;" and the reference in the sentences criticized by Graf is very properly to "nation" in the preceding verse. Consistently with this explanation, vers. 41, 42 in Greek read, "Behold, a people cometh from the north; and a great nation and many kings shall be stirred up from the uttermost parts of the earth, *having* bow and spear: *it is* cruel, and *has* no mercy." Not only is the text of the Septuagint different from that of the Hebrew, but also it makes excellent sense. The singular for the plural in the first half of chap. li. 28 is altogether the preferable reading. Indeed, it seems to be the only reading that harmonizes with the context. The plural "kings" in Hebrew is probably incorrect, as indicated by the singular pronoun "his" in the last sentence of the verse.

Thus a fair consideration of Graf's principal examples shows that there is not a particle of evidence of arbitrary alteration on the part of the translator. The charge, therefore, of wilful change of person and number is not only not sustained, but also shown to be foundationless. In none of

the foregoing examples is either the sense or the connection injured by the alteration, as Graf asserts. In some passages, the reading in the Hebrew is preferable to the reading in the Greek; but from this it does not follow that the translator was in any way to blame for the inferiority of the Alexandrian rendering. He was not responsible for the nature or condition of the ancient manuscript he used. It may have been, and, doubtless, was quite frequently imperfect. The Hebrew, too, in many places may have been, and, doubtless, was improved by later hands. Moreover, the original of the Hebrew was probably, in some instances, superior to that of the Greek, just as the original of the Greek was certainly, in other instances, superior to that of the Hebrew. There was not the least occasion for the translator to make the alterations that occur, and there is not the slightest reason to suppose that he did make them.

In his brief and partial discussion of the alterations, which occur almost as frequently as he asserts, but which do not testify as he alleges, Graf neither pretends to treat them thoroughly, nor attempts to classify them systematically. He simply gives a few examples of the two kinds just considered. They comprise, though, changes of species or conjugation (voice and mood), tense, gender, person, number, and case. Of certain

kinds of alteration, there are numerous examples; of others, there are not so many; of some, there is only one or two. As they all appear together in the Conspectus of the variations elsewhere, a few examples of each kind will be sufficient for the purposes of systematic classification. In some instances, the form in Hebrew is superior; in other instances, the form in Greek is preferable. The comparative merit of each reading will be left to the judicial consideration of each critic. Some of these alterations, it will be observed, were due to difference of punctuation; but none of them were due to arbitrariness on the part of the translator.

Except in cases where the letters were originally the same, the alterations indicate a special text-recension in nearly every instance. An exception, of course, must be made in the case of divergences which were required by the genius of the language in which the work of translation was done. An active for a passive, or a singular for a plural, and *vice versa*, are examples of this kind. Even then, as is frequently the case, where the form in Greek represents an excellent form in Hebrew, the original texts were probably different.

The instances of change of number, it should be observed, are very numerous. The plural for the singular in a great many passages, while, doubtless, sometimes due to different punctuation,

at other times to textual divergency, may have been due in general to the well-known fact that the plural is often used in Greek where the singular is used in Hebrew. The singular for the plural, on the other hand, seems almost always to indicate a textual difference. As both the singular and the plural occur occasionally in a single verse, it is possible that these forms were not so definitely fixed at one time as they are to-day, and as they have been since the Massoretic system became established.

The following classification furnishes illustrations of the chief kinds of alteration that occur :—

Species or Conjugation.

Kal for Niphal.—יֹאמְרוּ—יֵאָמֵר ("it shall be said"—"they shall say"), chaps. iv. 11; vii. 32; xvi. 14; בָּחֲרוּ—נִבְחַר ("it shall be chosen"—"they shall choose"), chap. viii. 3.

Kal for Piel.—לִשְׁנוֹת—לְשַׁנּוֹת ("to change"—"to repeat"), chap. ii. 36.

Kal for Hiphil.—רָאִיתִי—הִרְאִיתַנִי ("thou shewedst me"—"I saw"), chap. xi. 18; תְּבִאֵהוּ—יָבוֹא ("cause it to come"—"it may or shall come"), chap. xiii. 1; תִּשְׁמַע—אַשְׁמִיעֲךָ ("I will cause thee to hear"—"thou shalt hear"), chap.

xviii. 2; וַיַּכְשִׁלוּם—וַיִּכָּשְׁלוּ ("they have caused them to stumble"—"they shall stumble"), chap. xviii. 15; וַיַּשְׁמִיעוּ—וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ ("they had caused to hear"—"they had heard"), chap. xxiii. 22.

Kal for Hophal.—וְלֻקַּח—וְיִקְחוּ ("shall be taken up"—"they shall take up"), chap. xxix. 22.

Niphal for Kal.—יִשָּׁבֵר—יִשְׁבֹּר ("breaketh"—"is broken"), chap. xix. 11; נִקְרֵאת—קָרְאוּ לָךְ ("they have called thee"—"thou hast been called"), chap. xxx. 17; תִּשָּׂרֵף—תִּשְׂרֹף ("thou shalt burn"—"shall be burned"), chap. xxxviii. 23.

Niphal for Hiphil.—יִשָּׁמַע—מַשְׁמִיעַ ("publisheth"—"is heard"), chap. iv. 15; יִשָּׁמַע—הַשְׁמִיעוּ ("publish ye"—"let it be published"), chaps. iv. 5; v. 20.

Hiphil for Kal.—יַעֲבִרוּ—יַעַבְרוּ ("is passed away"—"have taken away"), chap. xi. 15.

Hiphil for Hophal.—הוּקַם—הֲקִימוּ ("is performed"—"have performed"), chap. xxxv. 14.

Hophal for Kal.—יוּשָׁב—יוֹשֵׁב ("inhabiting"—"being inhabited"), chap. ix. 10.

Hophal for Hiphil.—מָשְׁחָתִים—מַשְׁחִיתִם ("they deal corruptly"—"they are corrupted"), chap. vi. 28; הֻדְּחוּ—הִדִּיחָם ("he had driven them"—"they had been driven"), chap. xvi. 15.

Tense.

Perfect for Imperfect. — הָיוּ—יִהְיוּ ("shall become"—"were"), chap. v. 13; הָיָה—יִהְיֶה ("shall be"—"was"), chap. xxxv. 9.

Imperfect for Perfect.—תִּשְׁמָעוּ—שָׁמָעְנוּ ("we have heard"—"ye shall hear"), chap. xxx. 5.

Perfect for Infinitive.—עָשְׂתָה—עֲשׂוֹתָהּ ("to do"—"has done"), chap. xi. 15; וְאַכְרִית—לְהַכְרִית ("to cut off"—"I will cut off"), chap. xlvii. 4.

Infinitive for Perfect.—בְּבָחֲנִי—וּבָחַנְתָּ ("mayest try"—"to try"), chap. vi. 27; עֲשׂה—עָשָׂה ("did do"—"to do"), chap. xxii. 15.

Imperative for Perfect. — הִקְשַׁבְתִּי וָאֶשְׁמַע—הַקְשִׁיבוּ־נָא וּשְׁמָעוּ ("I hearkened and heard"—"hearken now and hear"), chap. viii. 6; זָרְעוּ, קָצָרוּ—זִרְעוּ, קִצְרוּ ("they have sown, they have reaped"—"sow, reap"), chap. xii. 13.

Imperative for Imperfect.—עוֹלְלוּ—יְעוֹלְלוּ ("they shall glean"—"glean"), chap. vi. 9.

Imperfect for Infinitive.—הֲגָנֹב רָצֹחַ וְנָאֹף וְהִשָּׁבֵעַ—וַתִּרְצְחוּ וַתִּנְאֲפוּ וַתִּגְנְבוּ וַתִּשָּׁבְעוּ ("to steal, to murder, and to commit adultery, and to swear," etc.—"ye murder, and commit adultery, and steal, and swear," etc.), chap. vii. 9; וַיִּסְכוּ—וְהַסֵּךְ ("to pour out"—"they pour out"), chap. vii. 18.

Perfect for Participle. — נָתַתִּי—נֹתֵן ("giving" —"I have given"), chap. v. 14; יָלַד — יֹלֵד ("travailing"—"hath travailed"), chap. xxx. 6.

Participle for Infinitive.—אֹמְרִים—לֵאמֹר ("to say"—"saying"), chaps. vi. 14; vii. 4; xi. 21; לְדַבֵּר — דֹּבֵר ("to speak" — "speaking"), chap. xxxviii. 4.

Imperfect for Participle.—הֹלֵךְ—יֵלֵךְ ("walking" —"shall walk"), chap. x. 23.

Gender.

Masculine for Feminine.—נַפְשׁוֹ—נַפְשָׁהּ ("herself"—himself"), chap. iii. 11.

Feminine for Masculine. — הֲשׁוֹב—הֲיָשׁוּב אֵלֶיהָ תָּשׁוּב אֵלָיו ("shall he return unto her?"—"shall she *verily* return unto him?"), chap. iii. 1.

Person.

First for Second. — נַפְשִׁי—נַפְשְׁךָ ("thy life"— "my life"), chap. xi. 21; עָשִׂיתִי—עָשִׂיתָ ("thou shalt make"—"I will make"), chap. xxviii. 13.

First for Third.—נָתַתִּי—נָתַן יְהוָה ("the Lord hath given"—"I have given"), chap. xxv. 5.

Second for First.—שָׁבַרְתִּי, נִתַּקְתִּי—שָׁבַרְתְּי, נִתַּקְתְּי ("I have broken, I have burst"—"thou hast

broken, thou hast burst"), chap. ii. 20; לִבִּי—לְבַבְכֶם ("my heart"—"your heart"), chap. viii. 18; עָלֵינוּ, עֵינֵינוּ—עֲלֵיכֶם, עֵינֵיכֶם ("for us, our eyes"—"for you, your eyes"), chap. ix. 17; שִׁבְרִי, מַכָּתִי—שִׁבְרֵךְ, מַכָּתֵךְ ("my hurt, my wound"—"thy hurt, thy wound"), chap. x. 19; נַפְשִׁי, עֵינִי—נַפְשְׁכֶם, עֵינֵיכֶם ("my soul, my eye"—"your soul, your eyes"), chap. xiii. 17.

Second for Third.—לָקְחוּ—לְקַחְתֶּם ("they received"—"ye received"), chap. ii. 30; מָרָתָה—מָרִית ("she hath been rebellious"—"thou hast been rebellious"), chap. iv. 17; בִּרְחֹבֹתֶיהָ—בִּרְחֹבֹתַיִךְ ("in her streets"—"in thy streets"), chap. xlix. 26.

Third for First.—עַל־פָּנַי—עַל־פָּנֶיהָ ("before me"—"before her"), chap. vi. 7; מַרְעִיתִי—מַרְעִיתָם ("my pasture"—"their pasture"), chap. xxiii. 1; הִדַּחְתִּים—הִדִּיחָם ("I had driven them"—"he had driven them"), chap. xxiii. 8; וְשַׂמְתִּי—וְיָשֵׂם ("I will set"—"he shall set"), chap. xliii. 10; וְהִצַּתִּי—וְהִצִּית ("I will kindle"—"he shall kindle"), chap. xliii. 12.

Third for Second.—אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם—אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם ("your fathers"—"their fathers"), chaps. iii. 18; vii. 25; xliv. 10; בְּגַדְתֶּם—בָּגְדָה ("ye have dealt treacherously"—"she has dealt treacherously"), chap.

iii. 20; צַוָּארְךָ — צַוָּארָם ("thy neck" — "their neck"), chap. xxx. 8; שְׁמַעְתֶּם—שָׁמְעוּ ("ye have obeyed"—"they have obeyed"), chap. xxxv. 18; אֶתְכֶם—אוֹתָם ("you"—"them"), chap. xxxviii. 5; קִנּוֹ — קִנֶּךָ ("thy nest" — "his nest"), chap. xlix. 16.

Number.

Singular for Plural (Noun).—מִשְׁפָּחוֹת—מִשְׁפַּחַת ("families" — "family"), chap. ii. 4; הַבְּעָלִים—הַבַּעַל ("Baalim"—"Baal"), chap. ii. 23; בְּמִבְטַחַיִךְ, לָהֶם—לוֹ, בְּמִבְטַחֵךְ ("thy confidences, in them"—"thy confidence, in it"), chap. ii. 37; כַּעֲנָנִים—כֶּעָנָן ("as clouds"—"as a cloud"), chap. iv. 13; מֶרְחַקִּים—מֶרְחָק ("distances" — "distance"), chap. viii. 19.

Singular for Plural (Verb).—שְׁמַעְתֶּם—שָׁמַעַתְּ ("ye have obeyed"—"thou hast obeyed"), chap. iii. 13; בָּגְדוּ—בָּגַד ("have dealt treacherously"—"has dealt treacherously"), chap. v. 11; וְיִשְׁמְעוּ—וְיִשְׁמַע ("they may hear"—"he may hear"), chap. vi. 10; דִּבַּרְתֶּם—דִּבַּרְתָּ ("speak ye" — "speak thou"), chap. xi. 2; עָשׂוּ—עָשִׂיתָ ("they have done"—"thou hast done"), chap. xxxviii. 9.

Singular for Plural (Adjective).—נִלְחָמִים—

נִלְחָם ("fighting"—"fighting"), chap. xxxiv. 7; הַנִּשְׁאָר—הַנִּשְׁאָרִים ("left"—"left"), chap. xl. 6; מְבַקֵּשׁ — מְבַקְשֵׁי ("seeking" — "seeking"), chap. xliv. 30.

Singular for Plural (Pronoun). — קוֹלוֹ—קוֹלָם ("their voice" — "his voice"), chap. vi. 23; שְׁבוּתוֹ — שְׁבוּתָם ("their captivity" — "his captivity"), chap. xxxi. 23; וּנְתַתּוֹ — וּנְתַתָּם ("put them"—"put it"), chap. xxxii. 14; אַתֶּם אֹמְרִים—אַתָּה אֹמֵר ("ye are saying"—"thou art saying"), chap. xxxii. 36, 43; עָלָיו—עֲלֵיהֶם ("upon them"—"upon him"), chap. xxxvi. 31; עָלֶיהָ—עֲלֵיהֶם ("to them"—"to it"), chap. xxxvi. 32.

Plural for Singular (Noun). — נְהָרוֹת — נָהָר ("river"—"rivers"), chap. ii. 18; דְּרָכַיִךְ—דַּרְכֵּךְ ("thy way"—"thy ways"), chaps. ii. 33; iv. 18; גּוֹיִם—גּוֹי ("nation" — "nations"), chaps. ii. 11; vi. 22; רָעוֹתַיִךְ—רָעָתֵךְ ("thy wickedness"—"thy wickednesses"), chap. iii. 2; דִּבְרֵי—דְּבַר ("word"—"words"), chap. xxxi. 10.

Plural for Singular (Verb).—הַהֵימִירוּ—הַהֵימִיר ("hath changed"—"have changed"), chap. ii. 11; הָלְכוּ—הָלְכָה ("she has gone"—"they have gone"), chap. iii. 6; יִפְקְדוּ—יִפְקֹד ("he shall set"—"they shall set"), chap. xiii. 21; עָשׂוּ—עָשָׂה ("it does"—

"they do"), chap. xviii. 10; גְּעַרְתֶּם—גָּעַרְתָּ ("thou hast rebuked"—"ye have rebuked"), chap. xxix. 27; וְהָיוּ—וְהָיְתָה ("it shall become"—"they shall become"), chap. xlix. 2.

Plural for Singular (Adjective). — הַיּוֹצֵא—הַיּוֹצְאִים ("going out"—"going out"), chap. v. 6; צְדָקוֹת—צֶדֶק ("righteous"—"righteous"), chap. xi. 20.

Plural for Singular (Pronoun). — לַעֲשׂתוֹ—לַעֲשׂתָם ("to perform it"—"to perform them"), chap. i. 12; קְצִירְכֶם, לַחְמֵיכֶם—קְצִירְךָ, לַחְמְךָ ("thy harvest, thy bread"—"your harvest, your bread"), chap. v. 17; שָׁמְעָם—שָׁמְעוֹ ("its fame"—"their fame"), chap. vi. 24; לִבְּכֶם—לִבּוֹ ("his heart"—"your heart"), chap. xvi. 12; אֹתָם—אתו ("it"—"them"), chap. xxv. 12; קוֹלָם—קוֹלָהּ ("her sound"—"their sound"), chap. xlvi. 22.

Plural for Dual.—הָאֲבָנִים—הָאָבְנָיִם ("the two stones"—"the stones"), chap. xviii. 3.

CASE.

Nominative for Objective. — הִטּוּ אֶת־אָזְנָם—הִקְשִׁיבָה אָזְנָם ("they inclined their ear"—"their ear hearkened"), chap. vii. 24, 26; תֵּרַדְנָה עֵינַי הוֹרִידוּ עַל־עֵינֵיכֶם דְּמָעוֹת—דִּמְעָה ("let mine eyes

run down with tears"—"let tears run down from your eyes"), chap. xiv. 17.

Objective for Nominative.—הֲיָשׁוּב אֵלֶיהָ עוֹד—הֲשׁוֹב תָּשׁוּב אֵלָיו עוֹד ("shall he return unto her again?"—"shall she *verily* return unto him again?"), chap. iii. 1.

CHAPTER VI.

THE VARIATIONS—SUBSTITUTIONS.

THE Substitutions also are very numerous and noteworthy. They present, moreover, a great variety of species. Taken together with the other kinds of variation, they greatly increase the evidence for the existence of special text-recensions. While they are all equally interesting, they are not all equally important in support of this hypothesis, for the reason that some of them were due to difference of punctuation. Many of them, however, bear the clearest witness to the existence of recensional divergences.

Not only is their number great, but also their nature is significant. They are, indeed, of such a character that they could not possibly have been due to wilful change on the part of the translator or transcriber. As the same general arguments, in answer to Graf's charge of arbitrariness, that were applied to the preceding class are also applicable to the present class of variations, it is superfluous to repeat them here. It is scarcely more than neces-

sary to indicate their nature and significance. Before proceeding to classify them for this purpose, though, it will be proper to examine some of the examples of supposed arbitrariness that he adduces, by way of once more showing his unfairness and unreasonableness.

Graf refers particularly to but one species of substitution, namely, that of pronouns for substantives. Of this species, he gives only a few examples; but each one helps to establish the hypothesis to which he is so bitterly and so uncompromisingly opposed. The substitution of "toward them" for "toward this people" in the first member of chap. xv. 1 exhibits an admirable reading. In the Septuagint, the latter words, "this people," appear in the second member of the verse, and the words "of my sight" are absent altogether. The verse in Greek reads, "Then said Jehovah unto me, Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be *toward them:* cast *this people* out, and let them go forth." The variations in this verse afford an interesting illustration of recensional divergences. The original of the Alexandrian was evidently different from that of the Massoretic text.

The substitution of "you" for "this people," and of "to you" for "to my people," in the middle of chap. xxix. 32, together with the other variations

in this verse, also affords a beautiful illustration of textual differences. A translation of the verse in Greek will fully demonstrate this statement, as well as advantageously exhibit the divergences. It reads, "Therefore, thus saith Jehovah, Behold, I will punish Shemaiah and his seed; *and they* shall not have a man among *you to behold* the good that I will do unto *you; they shall not see it.*" Here is conclusive evidence of a special text-recension. The verse in Greek has a peculiarly rhetorical Hebrew ending. The supposition that in one verse the translator arbitrarily made two substitutions, changed an indicative into an infinitive and a singular into a plural, added a conjunction and a sentence, and omitted an adjective and two sentences, is really too absurd to merit any further discussion. It is merely worth remarking, in this connection, that the simple assemblage of words, "because he hath spoken rebellion against the Lord," which occurs twice in the Hebrew text, here and in ver. 16 of the preceding chapter, does not occur at all in the Septuagint translation of this book. Hitzig supposes properly that in each of these two passages it is a gloss.

The substitution of "them" for "Elam," in the first member of chap. xlix. 37, is another excellent illustration of recensional divergency. The one word was as easy to reproduce in the translation as

the other was. No conceivable reason can be suggested for the substitution, unless it be that the pronoun was the more natural reading. The reference here is to "the outcasts of Elam," in the concluding sentence of the preceding verse. Instead of repeating the proper name, it is really preferable to supply a plural pronoun, as in the Septuagint. Not only is the Greek construction more natural, but also more in harmony with the other plural pronouns that occur throughout the verse. The Greek reads, "And I will cause *them* (the outcasts) to be dismayed before their enemies that seek their life: and I will bring upon them *according* to the heat of my anger; and I will send *my* sword after them *to their destruction*." One has only to compare the two texts to perceive that several other variations (one of them, "to their destruction," being idiomatic) prove a different original to have been the certain cause of such divergences.

As Graf has given only these few illustrations of this kind of substitution, it is unnecessary to examine any others in detail. His charge of arbitrariness is just as unsuccessful respecting this class of variations as respecting the preceding class. In every instance it is shown to be without foundation. Each one of his examples not only proves his allegation to be false, but also proves the hypothesis

of a special text-recension to be true. A multitude of other instances might be indicated that furnish evidence just as conclusive as those considered furnish. Their general nature and importance will appear in classifying and illustrating their several species. The different kinds may be arranged in five distinctive groups,—parts of speech, rhetorical expressions, syntactical forms, proper names, and letters.

Before exemplifying each class, it should be stated that, in the case of synonyms, where an article occurs for a noun, as "the princes" for "the princes of Judah," chap. xxiv. 1; or a noun for a pronoun, as "after the Holy One of Israel" for "after me," chap. ii. 2; or one proper noun for another, as "Jehovah the God of Israel" for "Jehovah," chap. xxxii. 28; or one common noun for another, as "inhabitants" for "men," chap. xi. 23; "land" for "men," chap. xxxvi. 31; "the city" for "the people," chap. xxxvii. 4; "in the land" for "in the cities," chap. xl. 5, etc., there is no reason whatever to suspect the translator of having made the changes. The character of his translation proves the suspicion to be groundless. He had no need to make such alterations, and without necessity he certainly would not have made them.

While, in the great majority of cases, the synonymous words and expressions are practically

equivalent, as well for the subject-matter as for the sense, there are places where the Greek presents the more difficult, and, for this reason, the preferable reading; for example, "the inhabitants of Chaldea" for "the land of the Chaldeans," chap. l. 45, to which Scholz has directed attention. "In the Greek text," as he rightly says, "according to Hebrew custom, the name of the people is placed as the name of the country; and the words must be translated 'the inhabitants of Chaldea.' It is absolutely inconceivable that the translator, if his Hebrew text had had 'land,' should have abandoned this perfectly proper and corresponding designation, and should have made the useless difficulty for his Greek readers."[1]

Parts of Speech.

Substitutions belonging to this class, it will be seen at once, were often due to punctuation, or rather to the utter absence of punctuation. In cases where the consonants were alike, the varia-

[1] "Im griechischen Texte ist der Völkername nach hebräischer Weise als Ländername gesetzt; und die Worte müssen übersetzt werden: 'Bewohner Chaldäa's.' Es ist geradezu undenkbar, dass der Uebersetzer, wenn sein hebräischer Text 'terra' gehabt hätte, diese ganz richtige und entsprechende Bezeichnung verlassen, und seinen griechischen Lesern die unnütze Schwierigkeit sollte gemacht haben." *Der masoreth. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung*, etc., pp. 107, 108.

tion naturally explains itself; but in cases where the consonants were not alike, the original manuscripts were evidently different. Such cases certainly indicate recensional divergences, and possibly indicate archaic readings in the ancient Hebrew texts. The following examples of the principal species may be given :—

Noun for Adjective. — אָנֻשׁ — אֱנֹשׁ ("sick" — "man"), chap. xvii. 9; אָנוּשׁ—אֱנוֹשׁ ("woeful"— "man"), chap. xvii. 16; פִּסֵּחַ—פֶּסַח ("lame"— "passover"), chap. xxxi. 8.

Adjective for Noun. — נֵס—נָס ("standard"— "fleeing"), chap. iv. 21; דֵּעָה—(רֹעִים) רָעֹה ("knowledge"—"feeding"), chap. iii. 15.

Noun for Article. — הַדָּבָר — דְּבַר יְהוָֹה ("the word"—"word of Jehovah"), chap. v. 13.

Article for Noun.—שָׂרֵי יְהוּדָה—הַשָּׂרִים ("the princes of Judah"—"the princes"), chap. xxiv. 1.

Noun for Adverb.—שָׁם—שֵׁם ("there"—name"), chap. xlvi. 17.

Adverb for Noun.—אֻמַּת—אֱמֶת ("measure"— "truly"), chap. li. 13.

Noun for Preposition.—אֶל—אֵל ("against"— "God"), chap. l. 29.

Preposition for Noun. — עִם—עַם ("people"— "with"), chap. xxxi. 2.

Noun for Pronoun.—אַחֲרַי—אַחֲרֵי קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל ("after me"—"after the Holy One of Israel"), chap. ii. 2; אֵלֶּה—אֵלָה ("these"—"oak"), chap. ii. 34; אֲלֵיהֶם—אֶל־הָעָם הַזֶּה ("upon them"—"upon this people"), chap. xi. 11; מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה—מְלָכֶיהָ ("her kings"—"kings of Judah"), chap. xxv. 18; בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא—בְּיוֹם יְהוָֹה ("at that day"—"at the day of Jehovah"), chap. xxv. 33; עָרֵי יְהוּדָה—עָרֶיהָ ("her cities"—"the cities of Judah"), chap. xxxiv. 1.

Pronoun for Noun.—חֲמַת יְהוָֹה—חֲמָתִי ("the fury of the Lord"—"my fury"), chap. vi. 11; לַיהוָֹה—לוֹ ("to Jehovah"—"to him"), chaps. viii. 14; xl. 3; לְמַעַן שְׁמֶךָ—לְמַעֲנֶךָ ("for thy name's sake"—"for thine own sake"), chap. xiv. 7; לְרַגְלַי—לִי ("for my feet"—"for me"), chap. xviii. 22; אָלָה—אֵלֶּה ("swearing"—"these"), chap. xxiii. 10; נָתַן יְהוָֹה—נָתַתִּי ("the Lord hath given"—"I have given"), chap. xxv. 5; אֶת־נִבְלָתוֹ, אֶת־אוּרִיָּהוּ—אוֹתוֹ, אוֹתוֹ ("Uriah, his dead body"—"him, him"), chap. xxvi. 23; עֵינֵי מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל—עֵינָיו ("the eyes of the king of Babylon"—"his eyes"), chap. xxxiv. 3; אֶת־יִרְמְיָהוּ—אוֹתוֹ ("Jeremiah"—"him"), chap. xxxviii. 6, 13.

Noun for Verb.—דִּבֶּר—דְּבַר ("hath spoken"—

"word"), chaps. ix. 11; xxiii. 17; חָפְצִי—חֲפַצְתִּי ("I delight"—"my delight"), chap. ix. 23; חֲרֹב—חֶרֶב ("slay"—"sword"), chap. l. 21; פְּקֻדָּתֶךָ—פְּקַדְתִּיךָ ("I will visit thee"—"thy visitation"), chap. l. 31.

Verb for Noun.—יֵבוֹשׁוּ—בֹּשֶׁת ("confusion"—"may be confused"), chap. vii. 19; וְעָשִׂיתִי—עֲתֶרֶת ("abundance"—"I will execute"), chap. xxxiii. 6; וָרָם—וְרָם ("haughtiness"—"is lifted up"), chap. xlviii. 29; כַּהֲפוֹךְ—כְּמַהְפֵּכַת ("as the overthrowing"—"as he overthrew"), chap. l. 40; נִסְכּוֹ—נָסְכוּ ("his molten image"—"they melt"), chap. li. 17.

Verb for Adjective.—שָׁדַד—שֹׁדֵד ("laying waste"—"hath laid waste"), chap. xxv. 36; יָלְדָה—יֹלֵד ("travailing"—"hath travailed"), chap. xxx. 6; בָּא וְיָצָא—בָּא וְיֹצֵא ("coming in and going out"—"came in and went out"), chap. xxxvii. 4; אֹמֵר—אָמֹר ("saying"—"to say"), chap. xliv. 26; גֵּאֶה—גָּאָה ("proud"—"has exalted"), chap. xlviii. 29.

Adjective for Verb.—נֹטֶה—נָטָה ("turneth aside"—"turning aside"), chap. xiv. 8; עֹמֵד—עָמַד ("stood"—"standing"), chap. lii. 12.

Verb for Adverb.—מָלְאוּ—מָלֵא ("aloud"—"were collected"), chap. xii. 6; יַחְדָּו—יָחֵדוּ ("together"—"shall be glad"), chap. xxxi. 13.

Adverb for Verb.—שָׂמָה—שָׁמָּה ("make it"—"there"), chap. xiii. 16; מֵאָנָה—מֵאַיִן ("refuseth"—"whence"), chap. xv. 18; שֵׁב—שׁוּב ("sit down"—"again"), chap. xxxvi. 15.

Verb for Interjection.—הוֹי—הָיָה ("alas!"—"is"), chap. xxx. 7.

Interjection for Verb.—הוֹי—הָיוּ ("shall be"—"alas!"), chap. li. 2.

Verb for Pronoun.—כֻּלֹּה—כָּלָה ("every one"—"ceased"), chaps. viii. 6; xv. 10; xx. 7.

Pronoun with Preposition for Verb.—בָּא—בָהּ ("it is come"—"upon her"), chap. xlvi. 20.

Pronoun for Article.—נַפְשָׁם—הַנָּפֶשׁ ("the soul"—"their soul"), chap. iv. 10; דְּרָכַי—הַדֶּרֶךְ ("the way"—"my ways"), chap. vii. 23; עַמִּי—הָעָם ("the people"—"my people"), chap. viii. 5; עַמּוֹ—הָעָם ("the people"—"his people"), chaps. xxvi. 23; xl. 6; מִלְחַמְתֵּךְ—הַמִּלְחָמָה ("the war"—"thy war"), chap. xlix. 26.

Article for Pronoun.—אַרְצֵךְ, עָרַיִךְ—הָאָרֶץ, הֶעָרִים ("thy land, thy cities"—"the land, the cities"), chap. iv. 7; עָרָיו—הֶעָרִים ("its cities"—"the cities"), chap. iv. 26; שְׁכֵנַי—הַשְּׁכֵנִים ("my neighbours"—"the neighbours"), chap. xii. 14; רַחְמָהּ—הָרֶחֶם ("her womb"—"the womb"), chap. xx. 17.

Conjunction for Article.—כַּשָּׁמַיִם—הַשָּׁמַיִם ("the heaven"—"as heaven"), chap. li. 53.

Conjunction for Pronoun.—כְּקֶשֶׁת—קַשְׁתָּם ("their bow"—"as a bow"), chap. ix. 2; כִּי—אֲשֶׁר ("which" —"because"), chap. xi. 17; כַּאֲשֶׁר—אֲשֶׁר ("what" —"as"), chap. xxxii. 24.

Conjunction for Preposition.—כְּהַר—לְהַר ("to a mountain"—"as a mountain"), chap. li. 25; כְּנָשִׁים—לְנָשִׁים ("to women"—"as women"), chap. li. 30.

Conjunction for Interjection. — כִּי־אִם—הִנֵּה ("behold"—"but if"), chap. vii. 8.

Interjection for Pronoun.—הִנֵּה—הֵמָּה ("these" —"behold"), chap. v. 5.

Adverb for Pronoun with Preposition.—שָׁם—בָּהּ ("in it"—"there"), chap. xlix. 18, 33.

Pronoun with Preposition for Adverb.—שָׁם— (בָּהּ) עָלֶיהָ ("there"—"in it"), chap. xxxv. 7.

Adverb for Noun with Preposition.—בִּירוּשָׁלִָם —שָׁם ("at Jerusalem"—"there"), chap. xxxv. 11.

Rhetorical Expressions.

This species of substitution is very frequent. It occurs in nearly every chapter of the book. In some instances, the variations probably arose from

similarity between the forms of the words; in other instances, they certainly arose from textual differences in the ancient manuscripts. In by far the greater number of instances, this latter will be found on close examination to be the case. They are all exceedingly interesting, but the following examples of the more important of them will suffice to show their nature and significance:—

Similar Text.—בְּהָדְשָׁהּ—בְּחָדְשָׁהּ ("in her month"—"in her humiliation"), chap. ii. 24; רְעִים—רֵעִים ("lovers"—"shepherds"), chap. iii. 2; כַּעֲרָבִי—כָּעֹרֵב ("as an Arabian"—"as a raven"), chap. iii. 2; נֹצְרִים—(צָרִים) צֹרְרִים ("watchers"—"companies"), chap. iv. 16; כְּאֵשׁ—כְּאִישׁ ("as a man"—"as fire"), chap. vi. 23; גַּלִּים—גֹּלִים ("heaps"—"captivity"), chap. ix. 10; הִמּוּלָה—הֲמוּלָה ("tumult"—"her circumcision"), chap. xi. 16; מִצָּפוֹן—מְצֻפֶּה ("from the north"—"overlaid"), chap. xv. 12; וַהֲשִׁבוֹתִים—וְהֹשַׁבְתִּים ("I will bring them again"—"I will cause them to dwell"), chap. xvi. 15; מָגוֹר—מְגוּר ("a terror"—"a settlement"), chap. xx. 4; חֵן—חֹם ("grace"—"heat"), chap. xxxi. 2; פֶּסַח—פִּסֵּחַ ("lame"—"passover"), chap. xxxi. 8; הַיּוֹנָה—(הַיְּוָנִית) הַיְּוָנָה ("oppressing"—"Grecian"), chaps. xlvi. 16; l. 16; מִקְוֵה—מִקְוֵה ("the hope"—"the

collector"), chap. l. 7; פְּרְיָהּ—פָּרֶיהָ ("her bullocks" —"her fruit"), chap. l. 27; וְיָבֵשׁוּ—וְיָבֵשׁוּ ("they shall be dried up"—"they shall be ashamed"), chap. l. 38; מֵחֶרֶב (מֵאֶרֶץ)—מֵחֶרֶב ("from the sword"—"from the land"), chap. li. 50.

Different Text.—הָאִשָּׁה—הָאָרֶץ ("the land"—"the woman"), chap. iii. 1; מוֹעֵצוֹת—שְׁרִרוּת ("stubbornness"—"devices"), chap. iii. 17; שִׁבְרֵיכֶם—מְשׁוּבֹתֵיכֶם ("your backslidings"—"your wounds"), chap. iii. 22; קִנָּמוֹן—קָנֶה הַטּוֹב ("sweet cane"—"cinnamon"), chap. vi. 20; דְּבְקוּבָם—דְּרָשׁוּם ("whom they have sought"—"to whom they have cleaved"), chap. viii. 2; תַּאֲוַת—שְׁרִרוּת ("stubbornness"—"desire"), chaps. ix. 13; xvi. 12; xviii. 12; וְתַעֲנֶינָה—וְתָבוֹאנָה ("they may come"—"they may speak"), chap. ix. 16; אוֹר—רוּחַ ("wind"—"light"), chaps. x. 13; li. 16; יְעֵנִים—תַּנִּים ("jackals"—"ostriches"), chap. x. 22; אַנְשֵׁי—יוֹשְׁבֵי ("men"—"inhabitants"), chap. xi. 23; יֵלְדוּ—יֵלְכוּ ("they grow"—"they bring forth"), chap. xii. 2; אָרְחֹתֵינוּ—אַחֲרִיתֵנוּ ("our latter end"—"our ways"), chap. xii. 4; מְעָרָה—עַיִט ("bird of prey"—"cave"), chap. xii. 9; נִשְׁבַּר—נִשְׁבָּה ("is taken captive"—"is destroyed"), chap. xiii. 17; הַגִּרֵם—הַאֲגִרֵם ("give them over"—"collect them"), chap.

xviii. 21; תַּעֲשׂוּ—תִּשְׁמְעוּ ("ye will hear"—"ye will do"), chap. xxii. 5; הֲדַר כְּבוֹדוֹ—דִּבְרֵי קָדְשׁוֹ ("his holy words"—"his glorious majesty"), chap. xxiii. 9; שְׂנְאָה—שְׁנִינָה ("a taunt"—"a hatred"), chap. xxiv. 9; רֵיחַ מוֹר—קוֹל רֵחַיִם ("the sound of the millstones"—"the perfume of myrrh"), chap. xxv. 10; הָאָרֶץ—הָעִיר ("the city"—"the country"), chap. xxix. 7; כְּעֵץ פְּרִי—כְּגַן רָוֶה ("a watered garden"—"a fruitful tree"), chap. xxxi. 12; רְעֵבָה—דָּאֲבָה ("sorrowful"—"hungry"), chap. xxxi. 25; אֶרֶץ—אִישׁ ("men"—"land"), chap. xxxvi. 31; הָעִיר—הָעָם ("the people"—"the city"), chap. xxxvii. 4; בַּבּוֹר—בַּחֲבָלִים ("with cords"—"into the pit"), chap. xxxviii. 6; יוֹם—עֵת ("the day"—"the time"), chap. xxxviii. 28; בְּאֶרֶץ—בְּעָרֵי ("in the cities"—"in the land"), chap. xl. 5; בְּיַעֲרוֹ—בְּעָרָיו ("in his cities"—"in his forest"), chap. l. 32.

Syntactical Forms.

This class of substitution, of which there are many examples, possesses a remarkable significance. Its number, too, is nearly as important as its nature. Comprising idiomatic expressions, which are peculiar to the Hebrew language, the cases

prove conclusively recensional divergences. The only variety necessary to note in this connection is that kind of Hebraism which consists in the joining of an infinite absolute to the finite form of a verb to give emphasis or intensity to the idea expressed. The following are illustrations of such hebraisms :—

Emphatic for Unemphatic Form.—תָּשׁוּב—יָשׁוּב שׁוּב ("return"—"verily return"), chap. iii. 1; הָיוֹ יִהְיֶה—יִהְיֶה ("were"—"really were"), chap. xxii. 24; נָתוֹן אֶתֵּן—נָתַתִּי ("I will put"—"verily I will put"), chap. xxxi. 33; וְנָסַב סָבִיב—וְנָסַב ("shall turn about"—"shall verily turn about"), chap. xxxi. 39; הִנָּתֵן תִּנָּתֵן—הִנְנִי נֹתֵן ("behold, I will give"—"verily it shall be given"), chaps. xxxii. 28; xxxiv. 2; וְשִׁכֵּר יַשְׁכִּיר—וְהִשְׁכַּרְתִּי ("I will make druuk"—"I will verily make drunk"), chap. li. 57.

Unemphatic for Emphatic Form. — וָאֲדַבֵּר וָאֲדַבֵּר אֲלֵיכֶם—אֲלֵיכֶם הַשְׁכֵּם וְדַבֵּר ("I spake unto you, rising up early and speaking"—"I spake unto you"), chap. vii. 13.

Proper Names.

Of this class of substitution there are several varieties, such as one proper noun for another, a

proper noun for a common noun, and *vice versa*. In some cases, the original texts were just the same; in other cases, they were different. The following examples of each variety may be given by way of illustration :—

Proper Noun for Proper Noun.—אָמוֹץ—אָמוֹן ("Amon"—"Amoz"), chaps. i. 2; xxv. 3; יֱהוִֹה אֱלֹהֶיךָ—צְבָאוֹת ("Lord of hosts"—"thy God"), chap. ii. 19; קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל—יְהוָֹה ("the Lord"—"the Holy One of Israel"), chap. iii. 16; אֱלֹהֵיהֶם—אֱלֹהֵי קְדוֹשָׁם ("their God"—"their Holy God"), chap. iii. 21; לֵאלֹהֵיכֶם—לַיהוָֹה ("to the Lord"—"to your God"), chap. iv. 4; יְהוָֹה—אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה ("the Lord God"—"the Lord"), chaps. vii. 20; xiv. 13; xxxii. 17; יְהוָֹה—יְהוָֹה צְבָאוֹת ("Lord of hosts"—"Lord"), chaps. vi. 9; ix. 16; xi. 20; xx. 12; xlix. 26; l. 33; li. 58; הָאֱלֹהִים—יְהוָֹה אֱלֹהֵינוּ ("Lord our God"—"God"), chap. viii. 14; יְהוּדָה—אֲדוֹמִים ("Judah"—"Idumea"), chap. ix. 25; מְאוּפָז—אוּפָז ("Uphaz"—"Mophaz"), chap. x. 9; הָאֱלֹהִים—יְהוָֹה ("Lord"—"God"), chaps. xiv. 10; l. 15; יְהוָֹה—יְהוָֹה אֱלֹהֵינוּ ("Lord our God"—"Lord"), chap. xiv. 22; יְהוָֹה—יְהוָֹה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת צְבָאוֹת ("Lord God of hosts"—"Lord of hosts"), chap. xv. 16; יְכָנְיָהוּ—כָּנְיָהוּ ("Coniah"—"Jecon-

iah"), chap. xxii. 24, 28; יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ—יְהוָה ("Lord"—"Lord our God"), chap. xxiii. 38; בּוּז—רוּז ("Buz"—"Roz"), chap. xxv. 23; פָּרָס—מָדָי ("Medes"—"Persians"), chap. xxv. 25; יְהוָה—יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל ("Lord"—"Lord God of Israel"), chap. xxxii. 28; יַאֲזַנְיָה—יְכָנְיָה ("Jaazaniah"—"Jeconiah"), chap. xxxv. 3; אֲרָם—אַשּׁוּר ("Syrians"—"Assyrians"), chap. xxxv. 11; יִשְׂרָאֵל—יְרוּשָׁלַםִ ("Israel"—"Jerusalem"), chap. xxxvi. 2; שְׁמַעְיָהוּ וְאֶלְנָתָן—שֶׁלֶמְיָהוּ וִיהוֹנָתָן ("Shemaiah and Elnathan"—"Shelemiah and Jonathan"), chap. xxxvi. 12; יִרְמְיָהוּ—בָּרוּךְ ("Jeremiah"—"Baruch"), chap. xxxvi. 32; יִרְאִיָּיה—שְׂרָיָה ("Irijah"—"Seraiah"), chap. xxxvii. 13, 14; אֱלִישָׁמָע—אֱלִישָׁע ("Elishama"—"Elisha"), chap. xli. 1; יְזַנְיָה בֶּן־הוֹשַׁעְיָה—עֲזַרְיָה בֶּן־מַעֲשֵׂיָה ("Jezaniah the son of Hoshaiah"—"Azariah the son of Maaseiah"), chap. xlii. 1; יְהוָה—יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים ("Lord"—"Lord God"), chaps. xlii. 4; li. 62; יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ—יְהוָה ("Lord thy God"—"Lord"), chap. xlii. 5; יְהוָה—אֱלֹהֵינוּ ("Lord our God"—"Lord"), chap. xlii. 20; הוֹשַׁעְיָה—מַעֲשֵׂיָה ("Hoshaiah"—"Maaseiah"), chap. xliii. 2; יְהוָה—אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵינוּ ("Lord, the Lord of hosts"—"Lord our

God"), chap. xlvi. 10; אֵיתָם—אֶלְעָלֵה ("Elealeh"—"Etham"), chap. xlviii. 34; נִבְרִים — נִמְרִים ("Nimrim"—"Nivrim"), chap. xlviii. 34; יְהוָה — יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת ("Lord"—"Lord of hosts"), chap. xlix. 18; יְהוֹיָכִין — יְהוֹיָקִים ("Jehoiachin"—"Jehoiakim"), chap. lii. 31.

Proper Noun for Common Noun.—צוֹר—צוּר ("rock"—"Zor"), chap. xxi. 13; אָחָז — אֶרֶז ("cedar"—"Ahaz"), chap. xxii. 15; צִיּוֹן — צִיֻּנִים ("waymarks"—"Zion"), chap. xxxi. 21; הַמִּשְׂגָּב—חֲמָת ("the citadel"—"Hamath"), chap. xlviii. 1; צְעוֹרֶיהָ — צוֹעֲרָה ("her little ones"—"Zoar"), chap. xlviii. 4; מַלְכָּם — (ל) מִלְכֹּם ("their king"—"Milcom"), chap. xlix. 1, 3.

Proper Noun for Adjective.—הַשְּׁלִישִׁיל—הַשְּׁלִישִׁי ("third"—"Salathiel"), chap. xxxviii. 14; אֵיתָן—אֵיתָם ("strong"—"Etham"), chap. xlix. 19; אֵיתָן—אֵיתָן גֵּיא ("strong"—"Gaithan"), chap. l. 44.

Proper Noun for Verb.—הֶעֱבִיר — (הִשְׁבִּי(ת ("pass by"—"Hishbi"), chap. xlvi. 17; חָתָּה — (גַּת(חֲגָת ("broken down"—"Hagath"), chap. xlviii. 1.

Common Noun for Proper Noun.—עַד־יַהַץ—

עָרֵיהֶם ("unto Jahaz"—"their cities"), chap. xlviii. 34.

Common Noun for Common Noun.—אוֹר—רוּחַ ("wind"—"light"), chaps. x. 13; li. 16; אִישׁ—אֶרֶץ ("men"—"land"), xxxvi. 31.

Verb for Proper Noun.—עָשׂוּ(ה)—עֵשָׂו ("Esau"—"have done"), chap. xlix. 8; פְּקוֹד ("Pekod"—"punish"), chap. l. 21.

Adverb for Proper Noun.—מְרִירוּת—מְרָתַיִם ("Merathaim"—"sharply"), chap. l. 21.

Letters.

The number of substitutions of letters is very large. Some of them were, doubtless, due to imperfection or corruption in the ancient manuscripts; others of them evidently arose from similarity of consonants in the early Hebrew and Aramaic alphabets. The resemblance between many of the letters in the earlier alphabets was much greater than it is now in our Hebrew Bibles. A comparison of the old Semitic characters will show at once how easy it must have been to be misled in transcribing them, especially if they happened to be written indistinctly. In the transitional stages from the primitive cursive form to the present

rectangular form of writing, it is quite natural that such substitutions should have often taken place. It is not always possible in retranslating to determine with certainty the nature of each substitution. For this reason, while most of the examples collected should be regarded as tolerably probable, a few of them must be regarded as purely conjectural but reasonably possible.

In some passages, it will be readily observed, the Hebrew, in other passages, the Greek exhibits the primitive as well as the superior form of text. Both their number and their nature are so interesting that the whole list of substitutions of letters is here appended for the critical examination and consideration of Hebrew scholars, each of whom may compare the merits of each reading for himself. For this reason, it is not necessary to direct attention in this connection to examples of superior reading in either text. Owing to the possible confusion of so many letters in the ancient alphabets, because of the irregularity and indistinctness of the characters, it has been thought advisable to submit the complete collection for the inspection especially of those particularly interested and skilled in Semitic palæography. The more doubtful instances of supposed substitution, it will be seen, are indicated by an interrogation point. The following is the list:—

א = ב (וּשְׁאֵרִי—וְשִׁבְרִי (?), li. 35). — ד (הַגְּאֻלָּה—
הַגְּדֻלָּה, xxxii. 8). — ח (הָלְכָה—אֵלֵךְ, ii. 25; בָּא—
בָּהּ, xlvi. 20; מִבֹּא—בְּנָהּ, xlvi. 25; הֵילִילוּ—אֲיַלֵּיל,
הַזְעִיקוּ—אֶזְעָק, xlviii. 31; הוֹרִידֵם—אוֹרִידֵם, li. 40).
— ח (שְׁאָפָה—סְחָפָה, ii. 24; נוֹהֲלוּ—נוֹאֲלוּ(?), v. 4;
הַהֶרֶב—הָאֹרְבִים, li. 12). — ע (פָּרְעָה—פֶּרֶה, ii. 24;
וְתַבַּעְנָה—וְתָבוֹאנָה, ix. 16; לְרַעֲבָה—לְדַאֲבָה, xxxi. 12;
רָעֵבָה—דָּאֲבָה, xxxi. 25; וְהַעֲבַרְתִּי—וְהַאֲבַדְתִּי, xlix.
38). — ת (תֵּצֵא—תֵּצַת, xxi. 12; נָצֹא תֵּצֵא—נָצֹת תֻּצַּת,
xlviii. 9; אֵיד—עֵת, xlviii. 16).
ב = ג (בָּעַלְתִּי—גָּעַלְתִּי (?), xxxi. 32). — ו (בַּעֲבוּר—
וַעֲבוֹדַ(ת), xiv. 4; בְּעֶבְרֵי—בְּצוּרֵי, xlviii. 28). — כ
(עֲבָרוֹ—עֲכוּר(?), xxiii. 9; סְבִיבֶיךָ—סְבָכֶיךָ, xlvi. 14;
הָבֵרוּ—הָכִינוּ(?), li. 11). — ל (וּבַבָּשָׁן—וְלַבָּשָׁן, xxii.
20). — מ (בַּדְּבָרִים—מִדְּבָרִים, xxxviii. 24; בְּאֶרֶץ—
מֵאֶרֶץ, xlvi. 10). — נ (הָרַבִּים—הָרָנִים(?), xi. 15).
— פ (מִתְבוֹאֲתֵיכֶם—מִתִּפְאַרְתְּכֶם(?), xii. 13; לְסָחֹב—
לִטְרֹף, xv. 3; וּלְחָרְבוֹת—וּלְחֶרְפַּת, xxv. 9; וּבְזָזוּ—
וּפָזְרוּ(?), l. 37). — צ (עֲבָרוֹ—עֲצוּר(?), xxiii. 9). — ק
(עָקֹב—עָמֹק, xvii. 9). — ר (בָּעָבִים —בַּחוֹרִים, iv. 29;
בַּשְּׁבִי—בְּשָׂרִם, xxx. 16; שְׁבָמָה—שְׂרֵמָה or עֲזֵרָמָה,
xlviii. 32).
ג = צ (יָגַעְתִּי—יָצַעְתִּי (?), xlv. 3).
ד = י (לָמֹּד—לְמַי, ii. 24). — ל (עַד—עַל, xxv. 31).
— ק (בַּמַּעֲצָד—וּמוּצָק or וּמֻצָּק(?), x. 3). — ר (פַּחְדָּתִי
—בָּחַרְתִּי, ii. 19; הֵעָה—רָעֹה, iii. 15; תָּנוּד—יָגוּר,
iv. 1; יִתְגּוֹדָדוּ—יִתְגּוֹרָרוּ, v. 7; דָּמִיתִי—הָרָמָה, vi. 2;
הָפְקַד—הַשְּׁקֵר, vi. 6; וְדְעִי—וְרֵעֵי, vi. 18; וְנִהְיָה—

וְנִרְמֶה, הִרְמָנוּ—הֲדִמָּנוּ, viii. 14; בֶּרֶיךָ—מְדַיִךְ, xiii. 25; נִרְדָּם—נִדְהָם, xiv. 9; מְרִי—מְדִי, xx. 8; אֶחָד—הָאַחֵר, xxiv. 2; דָּאֲבָה—לְרַעֲבָה—לְדַאֲבָה, xxxi. 12; רָעֵבָה—, xxxi. 25; אַחֵר—אֶחָד (bis), xxxii. 39; בְּיַד—בּוֹר, xli. 9; נִרְמְתָה—נִדְמְתָה, xlvii. 5; וָדֹמִּי—וָרֹמִּי, xlvii. 6; יְעָרָהּ—יְעָדָהּ, xlvii. 7; עִיר—עַד, xlviii. 32; עָרֵיהֶם—עַד־יַהַץ, xlviii. 34; יִרְאֶה—יִדְאֶה, xlix. 22; יֵרָמוּ—יִדַּמּוּ, xlix. 26; l. 30; הֲדָר—הֵידָד, xlix. 27; וְהַעֲבַרְתִּי—וְהַאֲבַדְתִּי, xlix. 38; תֵּרָמוּ—תִּדַּמּוּ, li. 6; הַיֹּרֵד—הֵידָד, li. 14; בְּרֹאשׁ—בְּדֵי־אֵשׁ, li. 58). = ת (בְּעֵת—בְּעַד, xi. 14; עֵת—אֵיד, xlviii. 16).

ה = א (אָקִים—הָקִים, xi. 5; אֵרָפֵא—הֵרָפֵא, xv. 18; וְאָעִיד—וְהָעֵד, xxxii. 25; וְאָשִׁיב—וְהֵשִׁיב, xlii. 12; וְאַכְרִית—לְהַכְרִית, xlvii. 4). = ב (בָּעֶרֶב—בִּכְרָה (?), ii. 23; בַּגּוֹיִם—הַגּוֹיִם, xxv. 11; בַּיָּם—הַיָּם, xxxi. 35; בַּכַּרְמֶל—הַכַּרְמֶל; וּבַגִּלְעָד—וְהַגִּלְעָד, l. 19). = ד (נִרְדָּם—נִדְהָם, xiv. 9). = ו (הֶעָוֶוּ—הַעֲוֵה, ix. 4; שׂוֹמְהוּ—שׂוֹמְיָהָ, xxxi. 7). = ח (לֶחֶם—לָהֶם, xvi. 7; הַמִּרְצָח—הַמְּרוּצָה, xxii. 17). = ם (אַתֶּם—אַתָּה, v. 17; וְלַגְּבִירִים—וְלַגְּבִירָה, xiii. 18; בַּעֲדָם—בַּעֲדָהּ, xxix. 7; קוֹלָם—קוֹלָהּ, xlvi. 22). = ס (וְרֹמֵס—וְרֹמֵה, iv. 29). = ע (תִּפְלַת—תְּהִלַּת, xlviii. 2). = ר (עֶדְרָם—עֵדָה, vi. 18; נִשְׁבַּר—נִשְׁבָּה, xiii. 17; הֶחָמַר—הַחֵמָה, xxv. 15). = ת (אַתָּה—אֲהָהּ, i. 6; xiv. 13; xxxii. 17; תִּוָּסְרִי—הִוָּסְרִי, vi. 8; מְלֶכֶת—מֵרָעָה (?), xvii. 16; נָוֵה—נְוֹת, xxxiii. 12).

ו = ב (בְּהַשְׂכֵּל—וְהַשְׂכֵּיל, iii. 15). = ד (צֵידְכֶם—צִיּוֹן, xxx. 17). = ח (הַרְבֵּה—חָרְבוּ, ii. 12; גָּבְרָה—גָּבְרוּ,

ix. 2; לְמְדוּ—לָמְּדָה, ix. 4; וּפִסַּח—הַפֶּסַח, xxxi. 8; עֵשָׂו—עָשָׂה (?), xlix. 8). = י (עֲרָבוֹת—עַד־בַּיִת, v. 6; הַהֹוָה—נִהְיָה, vi. 2; נִמְצְאוּ—מִכְּאֵצֵי, xv. 16; כְּמוֹ—כְּמֵי, xv. 18; שׁוּחָה—שִׂיחָה, xviii. 20, 22; וְהָיָה—יִהְיֶה; וְשָׁמַע—יִשְׁמַע, xx. 16; וְרָעוּם—יְרִעוּם, xxiii. 4; וְיָשְׁבוּ—וְיֹשְׁבֵי, xxxi. 24). = ך (לוֹ—לָךְ, xxii. 15). = ל (וְנָפַל—לִנְפֹּל, xxi. 9; וְסַעַר—לְסַעַר, xxiii. 19; וּמִקְוֵה—לְמִקְוֶה, l. 7). = ר (לְזַוְעָה—לְזַרְעָה (?), xxxiv. 17).

ךו = ף (מַהֲרוֹן—מַהֲרֵךְ, xii. 13). = ץ (אָמוֹן—אָמֹץ, i. 2; xxv. 3).

ז = ר (אָז—אוֹ, xi. 15). = צ (אֶזְעַק—אֶצְחַק (?), xx. 8). = ץ (אֶזְלוֹ—אֶעְרֹץ, xv. 17). = ר (וּבְזָזוּ—וּבְזָרוּ or וּפִזְּרוּ, l. 37). = שׂ (אֶזְעַק—אֶשְׂחַק (?), xx. 8).

ח = ד (יָחִיד—יָדִיד (?), vi. 26). = ה (הָרְבוּ—הַרְבֵּה, ii. 12; בְּקָדְשָׁה—בְּהֻקְדָּשָׁה, ii. 24; נִחַרְתּ—נִהֲרַת or הֲדֶרֶת, viii. 16; בְּמָחוֹל—בִּקְהַל, xxxi. 4, 13; וְחִלְּלוּ—וְהִלְּלוּ, xxxi. 5). = כ (נֶחְמְכוּ—נִכְבְּסוּ (?), xiii. 22; וַיְשַׁלְּחֵם—וַיַּשְׁלִכֵם, xxxviii. 11). = ך (יְשַׁלַּח—יַשְׁלִיךְ, xvii. 8). = מ (וְשׁוּחָה—וְשַׁמָּה (?), ii, 6; נְסִחַק—מְחַךְ (מִ)נָּס, xlvi. 15). = ע (מִיַּחֲקְךָ—מִיַּעֲקָךְ (?), ii. 25). = ר (לִכְתֹב—לְמָרְחָק (?), xv. 3).

ט = נ (שְׁפַטְיָה—שְׁפַנְיָה or צְפַנְיָה, xxxviii. 1).

י = ב (אֵידָם—אָבְדָם, xviii. 17). = ו (יֹאכְלוּ—וְאָכְלוּ, v. 17; עוֹלֵל יְעוֹלְלוּ—עוֹלְלוּ עוֹלְלוּ, vi. 9; יִרְכָּבוּ—וְרֶכֶב, vi. 23; לְגַלִּים—לְגָלוּת (?), ix. 10; יְצָאֻנִי—וְצֹאנַי; וּמִקִּים—מְקוֹם, x. 20; יַסְּרֵנִי—יַסְּרֵנוּ; תַּמְעִטֵנִי—תַּמְעִטֵנוּ, x. 24; שְׁלֹמִי—שְׁלֹמוֹ; שֹׁמְרֵי—שְׁמָרוּ, xx. 10; רֹדְפַי—

רָדְפוּ; יִכָּשְׁלוּ—וְהִשְׂכִּל, xx. 11; יָמֻתוּ—וָמֵתוּ, xxi. 6; לִי עַבְדִּי—לְעָבְדוֹ, xxvii. 6; שְׂרִידֵי—שְׁדוּדֵי, xxxi. 2; —לוֹ, xxxi. 3; תִּטְּעִי—תִּטְּעוּ, xxxi. 5; בַּיַד—בּוֹר, xli. 9; דֹּרְכֵי—דִּרְכוּ, xlvi. 9; בְּחַיִל—בְּחוֹל, xlvi. 22). = ם (כַּלּוֹתִי—כְּלוֹתָם, ix. 15; מַרְעִיתִי—מַרְעִיתָם, xxiii. 1; בַּשְּׁבִי—בְּשָׂרִם, xxx. 16). = שׁ (יִרְאִיָּה— שְׂרָיָה, xxxvii. 13, 14). = ת (וְרָעִים—וְרָעִתָם, vi. 29; קִבְרֵי—קְבָרֹת, xxvi. 23).

יו = ע (יוֹם—עֵת(?), xxxviii. 28).

ים = ך (מִיקָבִים—בִּיקָבֶיךָ, xlviii. 33).

יג = א (לִשְׁנִינָה—לִשְׂנֵאָה, xxiv. 9).

כ = ב (כַּאֲשֶׁר—בַּאֲשֶׁר, v. 19; שִׁכּוֹר—שָׁבוּר, xxiii. 9; כַּחֲלַקְלַקּוֹת—בַּחֲלַקְלַקּוֹת, xxiii. 12). = ד (יֵלְכוּ—יֵלְדוּ, xii. 2). = י (כַּלְכֵּל—כָּלִיל(?), xx. 9). = מ (כַּהֵמָּה— מֵהֵמָּה, xxxvi. 32). = נ (אוֹלִיכֵם—אוֹלִינֵם, xxxi. 9). = ע (בִּכְרָה—בָּעֶרֶב, ii. 23). = ק (בִּכְרָה—בֹּקֶר(?), מְשָׂרֶכֶת—מַשְׂרֶקֶת, ii. 23; כָּרוּ—קָרְאוּ, xviii. 20).

ך = ו (עִמְּךָ—עִמּוֹ, xxxi. 7). = ל (יֵלֵךְ—יְלֵל, xlvi. 22). = ם (יָרֵךְ—יוֹם, xxxi. 19). = ים (עִמְקֵךְ—עֲנָקִים, xlix. 4). = ן (אֵיךְ—אָן or אֵין, xxxvi. 17).

ל = ב (לָהֶם—בָּהֶם, viii. 9; לָכֶם—בָּכֶם, xiv. 13; לְכֹל —בְּכֹל, xix. 13; xxix. 22; לַנְּבִאִים—בַּנְּבִאִים, xxiii. 9; לָךְ—בָּךְ, xlvi. 11; לָבוֹא—בְּבוֹא, xlvi. 13; לְיִשְׂרָאֵל —בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל, xlix. 1). = ד (אָבְלָה—אֲבַדֵּה = אֲבַדּוֹן, xii. 11; אֶחְמוֹל—אֶחְמוֹד, xiii. 14; עַל—עַד, xxxi. 39). = ו (לְהַכְרִית—וְאַכְרִית, xlvii. 4). = מ (יִצְלַח—יִצְמַח, xxii. 30; לְשָׁלָל—לְשַׁמָּם, xlix. 32). = ן (נִרְגַּל—מַרְגֵּן,

xxxix. 3). = ר (וָאֶעְלֹז—וָאֶעְרֹץ, xv. 17; כִּכְלִי—כְּכָרֵי, xxv. 34). = ת (אֵלַיִךְ—אִתָּךְ, ii. 19).

מ = ב (מִצִּיּוֹן—בְּצִיּוֹן, ix. 18; מֵרֶחֶם—בְּרֶחֶם, xx. 17; מַעֲשֵׂיָה—בַּעֲשֵׂיָה, xxi. 1; מִשְּׁלֹשׁ = מִן־שְׁלֹשׁ—בִּשְׁלֹשׁ, xxv. 3; מִנֹּא—בָּנָהּ, xlvi. 25; מִיקָבִים—בִּיקָבֶיךָ, xlviii. 33; נִמְרִים—נִבְרִים, xlviii. 34; סָמָר—כַּבִּיר(?), li. 27; מִבָּבֶל—בְּבָבֶל; מֵאֶרֶץ—בְּאֶרֶץ, li. 54). = ה (מִגְּבָעוֹת—הַגְּבָעוֹת, iii. 23; כְּמוֹהֶם—כְּמֹהֵה, xli. 17). = ט (לִמַּדְתְּי—לְטַמֵּא(?), ii. 33). = כ (מִמֶּנּוּ—מִכֶּם, iv. 8; מִבְּכִי—כִּבְכִי, xlviii. 32). = ל (מַלְכָּם—מִלְכֹּל, xlix. 1). = נ (מִתָּן—נָתָן or נֹתֵן, xxxviii. 1; עִמְקָם—עֲנָקִים, xlvii. 5; עִמְקֵךְ—עֲנָקִים, xlix. 4). = צ (הָקִימוּ—הָקִיצוּ, li. 12). = ק (בִּמְחוֹל—בְּקָהָל, xxxi. 4, 13). = ר (זִמַּת—זָרַת(?), xiii. 27). = ת (מָגוֹר—תָּגוּר, vi. 25; יוֹם—עֵת, xxxviii. 28).

ם = נו (עֹשִׂים—עָשִׂינוּ, xxvi. 19). = יר (הָעָם—הָעִיר, xxxvii. 4). = ת (לְגַלִּים—לִגְלוֹת(?), ix. 10).

נ = ג (תָּנוּד—יָגוּר, iv. 1). = ד (נִחֲרַת—הֲדָרַת(?), viii. 16). = ח (תְּנַבֵּל—תְּחַבֵּל, xiv. 21). = כ (נָחַר—כִּחַד(?), vi. 29). = מ (נֵרְגַל—מַרְגַּן, xxxix. 3; נֹף—מֹף, xlvi. 14; וּבְנֹתֶיהָ—וּבָמֹתֶיהָ, xlix. 2). = ר (הַחֲנֻיוֹת—הַהֶרֶת, xxxvii. 16).

נו = ם (מִמֶּנּוּ—מִכֶּם, iv. 8; אֵינֶנּוּ—אֵינָם, xxxi. 15; אֲרִיצֶנּוּ—אֲרִיצֵם, xlix. 19).

ן = ה (וְאֵין—וְאַיֵּה(?), vi. 14). = ם (חֵן—חֹם, xxxi. 2).

ס = ט (לִסְחֹב—לִטְרֹף(?), xv. 3). = כ (סָמָר—כַּבִּיר(?), li. 27). = מ (לִי סוּרֵי—לְמָר, ii. 21). = שׁ (הֵסִירוּ—

הַשְׁאִירוּ(?), v. 10). = שׂ (וְנִשְּׂאוּ—וְנָסְעוּ, xxxi. 24).
= ת (הוֹתִירוּ—הֵסִירוּ(?), v. 10).

ע = א (וְנִשְּׂאוּ—וְנָסְעוּ, xxxi. 24; מְלָאָה—מַעֲלָה, xlviii. 5). = ז (רֹגֶז—רֹגַע(?), xxxi. 35). = ח (בְּעָבִים—בַחֹרִים, iv. 29; אֶזְעַק—אֶצְחַק or אֶשְׂחַק, xx. 8; בָּעַלְתִּי—בָּחַלְתִּי(?), xxxi. 32). = י (יָקֵד—עָצֻר(?), xx. 9). = כ (מְלֶכֶת—מֵרֹעָה(?), xvii. 16). = פ (צְעִירֵי—צְפִירֵי, l. 45). = צ (בְּצוּרֵי—בְּעֶבְרֵי(?), xlviii. 28). = שׁ (רֹגֶשׁ—רֹגַע(?), xxxi. 35).

פ = ב (בָּחַרְתִּי—פַּחְדָּתִי, ii. 19). = כ (יִכָּלֵא—יִפָּלֵא, xxxii. 17, 27). = שׁ (הַשֹּׁקֶר—הָפְקַד, vi. 6).

ף = ך (נִסְחַף—נָס (מִ)מְּךָ(?), xlvi. 15).

צ = ג (וְגַלְמוּד—וְצַלְמָוֶת, ii. 6). = ח (מִבְחָר—מִבְצָר, vi. 27). = מ (בְּמֵעַיִךְ—בִּצְעֵךְ, li. 13). = ס (הַצִּיגַנִי—הִסִּיגַנִי(?), li. 34). = ק (יָקֵד—עָצֻר(?), xx. 9). = שׁ (הַשִּׂיגַנִי—הִצִּיגַנִי(?), li. 34).

ץ = ם (עָרֵיהֶם—עַד־יַהַץ, xlviii. 34). = ן (בְּאֶרֶץ—בְּאוֹן, xliii. 13). = ון (צִיּוֹן—צִיץ, xlviii. 9).

ק = ג (הַמִּזְלָגוֹת—הַמִּזְרָקוֹת, lii. 18). = ד (סָפַקְתִּי—כָּפַדְתִּי, xxxi. 19). = ח (הִתְחַלְחָלוּ—הִתְקַלְקָלוּ, iv. 24). = כ (נִתְּכָה—נִתְּקוּ, vi. 29). = מ (עָמֹק—עָקֹב, xvii. 9). = צ (קוֹלֵעַ—צוֹלֵעַ, x. 18). = ר (הַצִּינֹק—הַצִּנּוֹר, xxix. 26).

ר = ד (יְרֹעוּךְ—יְדָעוּךְ, ii. 16; עֲרָבוֹת—עַד־בַּיִת, v. 6; נָחַר—כָּחַד(?), vi. 29; עֶבְרָתוֹ—עֹבְדֵהוּ or עֲבָדָתוֹ, vii. 29; בְּאַרְמְנוֹתֵינוּ—בְּאַדְמַתְכֶם, ix. 20; בַּעֲבוּר—(ת)וַעֲבוֹדַ, xiv. 4; תַּרְמִית—תַּדְמִית(?), xiv. 14; xxiii. 26; הֲיָרֹעַ—הֲיָדֹעַ, xv. 12; וְהַעֲבַרְתִּי—וְהַעֲבַדְתִּי, xv. 14; קָרִים

—קָדִים, xviii. 14; יָקֶד—עָצֵר (?), xx. 9; בָּם־עִיר—בְּמוֹעֵד, xxxi. 8; יִסְפְּדוּ—יִשָּׂרְפוּ, xxxiv. 5; כַּעֲרוֹעֵר—כְּעָרוֹד, xlviii. 6; יָרִיקוּ—יָדִיקוּ, xlviii. 12; עֶבְרָתוֹ—עֲבֹדָתוֹ, xlviii. 30; קִיר־חָדָשׁ—קִיר־חָרֶשׂ, xlviii. 31, 36; זֵדִים וְזֵרוּהָ—זָרִים וְזָדוּהָ, li. 2; רִיק—דַּק, li. 34; וּשְׁאֵרִי—וְשֹׁדִי (?), li. 35; רִבְלָתָה—דִּבְלָתָה, lii. 9, 10, 26). = ו (יָמֶךָ—יוֹם, xxxi. 19; בְּאוֹן—בְּאֶרֶץ, xliii. 13). = ח (בְּאָחוּז—בָּאָרֶז, xxii. 15). = י (אֵיבָתוֹ—אַרְבּוֹ or הָאֵיבָה, ix. 7). = ינ (הֲבֵרוּ—הָכִינוּ (?), li. 11). = כ (לְזָרוֹת—לְזַכּוֹת (?), iv. 11). = ל (מֵרֹעָה—מִלֶּכֶת (?), xvii. 16; הַמִּזְרָקוֹת—הַמִּזְלָגוֹת, lii. 18). = נ (נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר—נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר, xlvi. 2). = ן (אָמַר—אָמֵן, xv. 11). = ת (סַמְגַּר—סַמְגַּת, xxxix. 3).

שׂ = שׁ (שָׁאֲפָה—שׂחָפַת = סְחָפַת, ii. 24; וָאַשְׁבִּעַ—וָאַשְׂבִּעַ, v. 7; שְׁבֻעֹת—שִׁבְעַת, v. 24; שׁוּחָה—שִׂיחָה, xviii. 20, 22; יִכָּשְׁלוּ—וְהִשְׂכִּיל, xx. 11; נָשֹׁא—נִשֵּׂא, xxiii. 39; לִשְׁנִינָה—לְשִׂנְאָה, xxiv. 9; אָנוּשׁ—נְשָׂאתִי, xxx. 12; תַּשִּׁאוּ—תִּשְׂאוּ, xxxvii. 9; נָשִׁיר—יְשִׂיאֲכֶם, xliv. 9.

שׂ = שׁ (מִשָּׂרֶכֶת—מְשָׁרֶקֶת, ii. 23; תִּשָּׂא—תִּשְׁאַל (?), vii. 16; xi. 14; וְשָׂמָה—וְשָׁמָּה, xiii. 16; שָׂדַי—שָׁדַיִם, xviii. 14; שְׂרִידֵי—שְׁדוּדֵי, xxxi. 2; קִיר־חָרֶשׂ—קִיר־חָדָשׁ, xlviii. 31, 36). = עז (שִׂבְמָה—עֲזֵרָמָה, xlviii. 32).

ת = א (לִמַּדְתְּ—לְטַמֵּא, ii. 33). = ד (וְצַלְמָוֶת—וְגַלְמוּד, ii. 6). = ה (וְיוֹלֶדֶת—וְיָלְדָה, xxxi. 8). = ט (יָפַתֵּשׁ—יְפַטֵּשׁ, xxxi. 40). = י (תָּגוּר—יָגוּר, iv. 1; רָעָתֵךְ—רֵעַיִךְ, xxii. 22; תִּתְבּוֹנְנוּ—יִתְבּוֹנָנוּ, xxiii. 20). = יע (תַּנִּים—יְעֵנִים, x. 22; xlix. 33). = נ (בַּעֲתָה—מְעֹנָה, iii. 4).

CHAPTER VII.

THE ORIGIN OF THE VARIATIONS.

HAVING accounted in general for the variations, it next becomes expedient fully to explain them in detail. Important as it is to know their nature, to understand their origin is still more important. Had they all a similar origin? Were they all due to the same cause? If they were due to different causes, why and how was this the case? So far as practicable, it is particularly desirable to obtain a definite answer to these questions, not only for the sake of solving the problem of their origin, but also for the sake of understanding how to deal with the divergences in comparing the Hebrew with the Greek. When the variations have received an adequate explanation, then we shall be in position to see what conclusions the deviations of the version warrant respecting the contemporary Hebrew of the Bible. Not till this has been accomplished shall we be able rightly to estimate the valuable help the Septuagint is adapted to afford, as well in reconstructing as in correcting the present Massoretic text.

Several causes of divergency have been already indicated. In order to ascertain them all, it will be necessary to analyze somewhat more closely the enormous mass of simple and complex variations that occur. In this way only can one properly expect to discover the fundamental principles that underlie them. The method here adopted of translating the Greek back into the Hebrew enables one to deduce these primary principles to the best possible advantage. Before a deviation has been retranslated, it often seems arbitrary and capricious. It is partly, if not wholly, because of this fact that the charge of arbitrariness against the Greek translator has been received with favour in such unexpected quarters and by such divergent schools. By the method of literal retranslation, which is purely philological and not by any means mechanical, a large number of remarkable divergences, which otherwise would appear inexplicable, can be readily and reasonably explained. By this method, moreover, the underlying principles can be traced with almost mathematical precision and with almost scientific certainty. The process of accounting for the variations thus becomes a matter, not of theory but of principle, not of hypothesis but of proof.

Such a scientific explanation has a further purpose. A complete account of the causes of textual

variation will help us to determine the laws of textual transmission. By showing how the divergences arose in this prophetic book, we may also show how they arose in the other prophetic books. Indeed, the principles of explanation which apply to the variations in Jeremiah apply, to a greater or a lesser extent, to those in all the Jewish Scriptures. An illustration of some one or other of them appears in every Hebrew writing of the Bible. It may not be, perhaps, too much to say that in most, if not all, of the books of the Old Testament, illustrations, on a larger or a smaller scale, of every principle deducible from this investigation may be somewhere found. The question of the origin of the variations, therefore, is of paramount importance, and demands a thorough and impartial consideration.

The origin of the variations cannot, of course, in every case, be certainly explained. Each text has had its own particular history. Each, too, has shared a very different fate. The fortunes and misfortunes of ancient manuscripts, like those of nations and of individuals, are very varied and very difficult to determine. Much of their history always has been, and ever will be, wrapped in complete obscurity. In the nature of things, without miraculous intervention such as the Scripture writings neither claim nor warrant, it could

not possibly be otherwise. This fact is too well known to need discussion, as well as too irrelevant to the present subject to call for further treatment here. Although it is impossible to account for every single variation with absolute certainty, yet the most of them may be explained with tolerable probability.

Before attempting to explain the origin of the variations, and to point out the principles to be applied in systematically accounting for them, it will be proper to observe that the question is a complicated one. The divergences had not a common origin. Some were due to one cause, some to another cause, and some to a combination of causes. The principles deduced and demonstrated in the subsequent discussion, though, will show that there was a worthy reason for the deviation of the version in almost every instance, as well as indicate a possible explanation of the variation in nearly every case. They will also prove that the translator of the Septuagint, as unworthily insinuated, was not a dishonest and ignorant pretender, who arbitrarily tampered with the sacred text; but an honest and efficient scholar, who faithfully reproduced the original Hebrew, so far as the imperfect and corrupt condition of his manuscript allowed.

The first cause of variation was *text-recension.*

This was the fundamental ground of the deviations. In the foregoing investigation, it has been shown that a prodigious number of them was due directly to recensional divergences in the ancient Hebrew manuscripts. The originals, however, of the Greek and Hebrew texts respectively were not entirely unlike. Though different, they were not altogether different. At one time, too, they were a great deal more alike than they are now. Their agreement at the present time, moreover, is much more complete than has been commonly supposed. That is, the divergences in the ancient text-recensions were not so frequent as the deviations in the Alexandrian version seem to indicate. In many places, where the divergences appear considerable, when scientifically analyzed, they point to a very similar original. In many other places, where the divergences appear remarkable, when literally retranslated, they exhibit an identical Hebrew text. In addition to the examples given in the preceding chapters of this work, others will be given in illustration of other principles of deviation still to be discussed.

A second cause of variation was *interpolation*. This was a very fruitful source of deviation. As has been pointed out repeatedly in discussing the omissions, there is abundant evidence, admitted, not merely by Movers and Hitzig, but even by

Graf himself, that the Massoretic text has been materially amplified by glosses. The hand of an interpolator is often manifest, especially in certain portions of the book. The number of probable interpolations is very large. A considerable proportion of the omissions appear to owe their origin exclusively to this cause. Such glosses may have been due, partly to the introduction of kindred matter from other books of Scripture, and partly to the transference of explanatory matter from the margin to the body of the text. Many examples of interpolation have been already indicated. Hence, it is unnecessary to repeat them or to multiply them here.

A third cause of variation was *revision.* This was, perhaps, a more prolific source of deviation than that of simple interpolation, inasmuch as it seems to have been systematically practised by editors or redactors appointed for the purpose. Graf finds it convenient, for the most part, to pass over this manifest peculiarity of the Hebrew. Other scholars, though, like Movers, Hitzig, Bleek, and Kühl, have justly indicated its significance. Scholz, too, has collected and discussed a number of important passages which furnish striking illustrations of revisional divergences. One of the most remarkable is chap. x. 2-16. As some features of the variations in this section have

already been described, it is sufficient here to add that the absent verses in this section were easy both to translate and to interpret; and that, therefore, there is, not only the less reason to believe that they were intentionally omitted, but also the more reason to believe that they were arbitrarily inserted. Other interesting passages, particularly pointed out by Scholz, are chaps. xxvii. 16–22; xxix. 11; xxxi. 17; xl. 4. He supposes very plausibly that at first and for a time the apparent insertions in these passages possessed the form of marginal observations or remarks. "By degrees," he says, "these observations, here and there, swelled to such a multitude that it became necessary to put order into these additions which had been arranged amongst themselves in rows; that is, these passages underwent a revision. This was evidently not performed by one who was unacquainted with the sacred Scripture, but by a teacher, and certainly, too, by one of the most illustrious of teachers." [1]

A fourth cause of variation was *transcription*. It is probable that a number of divergences were

[1] "Nach und nach schwollen diese Bemerkungen stellenweise zu solcher Menge an, dass es nothwendig wurde, Ordnung in diese an einander gereihten Zusätze zu bringen, d. h. diese Stellen erfuhren eine Ueberarbeitung. Diese ist selbstverständlich nicht von einem der heiligen Schrift Unkundigen ausgegangen, sondern von einem Lehrer und auch unter diesen gewiss von einem der angesehensten." *Der masoreth. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung*, etc., p. 104.

due to this cause. Errors on the part of copyists occur, to a greater or a lesser extent, in nearly every ancient manuscript. It is also probable that mistakes of this kind in some degree belong to both the texts. A few examples of variation which seem to have been owing to so-called Homœoteleuton, or like-ending clauses, are, perhaps, most easily and naturally explained in this way. Graf and Hitzig both endeavour to account for some of the omissions on this ground. The latter, for example, needlessly suggests that the sentence, "the man and the beast that are upon the face of the earth," chap. xxvii. 5, has fallen out of the Septuagint, as indicated, through oversight. He also unnecessarily supposes that the omissions from the middle of ver. 12 to the end of ver. 14 of the same chapter, were due to a similar cause; but the supposition has very little probability. The eye of a transcriber would hardly overlook so many words at once; and besides, as Hitzig himself admits, ver. 13 interrupts the connection between admonition and dissuasion in this passage, and was most likely wanting in the original of the Greek. It seems probable that additions rather than omissions arose from Homœoteleuton, and that, when the one or the other was due to this cause, only a few words at most would be added or omitted at a time. In transcribing letters and words of like form, or

letters and words of similar sound, a copyist might easily make a mistake. Indeed, an occasional error of this sort was almost inevitable. For this reason, therefore, some of the additions, omissions, transpositions, alterations, and substitutions of letters may have been, and, doubtless, were due to this cause. As sometimes the one and sometimes the other exhibits the better reading, it is often impossible to tell in which recension the error of transcription arose. This can only be conjecturally determined by the sense required by the context in each case.

A fifth cause of variation was *corruption*. Many deviations unquestionably arose because of an imperfect text. There is conclusive evidence that the originals, both of the Hebrew and the Greek, were more or less corrupt. Old writings cannot be transmitted free from imperfection. From various causes, and in many ways, they suffer from corruption, owing to the wear and tear of time. This corruption may be due partly to great age, partly to careless penmanship, and partly to imperfect preservation. Besides, illegible, indistinct, or mutilated parchment rolls have been occasionally rendered more imperfect, it is supposed, by efforts to restore them. Thus difficulties of translation are materially increased by the uncertainty often experienced in deciphering obscurely written,

badly worn, or poorly preserved manuscripts. Where a variation was most likely due to corruption arising from transmission, it is often difficult to decide with certainty which recension was the more imperfect. In some places, the imperfection was manifestly in the Massoretic recension, as, for instance, chaps. iv. 1; xi. 15; xxxi. 2; xl. 5. In other places, the fault was clearly in the Alexandrian recension, as, for instance, chaps. xxvii. 18–22; xxxi. 22. In a few places, there may have been corruptions in each text, as, for example, chaps. ii. 23, 24, 31; iii. 3, where the two texts seem originally to have been substantially the same.

A sixth cause of variation was *abbreviation*. Although there are not many examples of divergent readings that have arisen from this cause, yet there appear to be a few. It has often been conjectured that discrepancies of numbers in different parts of the Old Testament may be explained by assuming the existence at one time of a system of symbolical notation. But, inasmuch as no such symbols of notation occur in the present text of the Hebrew Bible, this conjecture has been regarded as ingenious but improbable. The modern Jews, though, made frequent use of abbreviations, and the numerical employment of letters was once common alike to the Hebrews and the Greeks. Hence, it is highly probable that similar signs of number,

and similar symbols of abbreviation, may have been employed either by the original authors of Scripture, or by the later copyists and scribes. In several cases of difference of dates in this book, abbreviation seems to be the most natural as well as the most probable explanation, and it may possibly explain numerical divergences in other books. The "eighth" instead of the "fifth" year of Jehoiakim, chap. xxxvi. 9, is an example of this kind. The symbol for the number 5 = ה might be easily mistaken for that of the number 8 = ח, a species of substitution that very frequently occurs, as the list of resembling letters in the preceding chapter indicates. Movers and Hitzig suppose אֵיךְ, chap. iii. 19, is an abbreviation for אָמֵן יְהֹוָה כִּי. The example is interesting, and the explanation is possible. Again, according to Movers, אִישׁ, chap. v. 1, which is wanting in the Septuagint, has come into the Hebrew text, partly through abbreviation, and partly through repetition of the similar consonants אִם־יֵשׁ. Whether probable or not, the suggestion is worthy of consideration. "My fury," for "the fury of the Lord," chap. vi. 11, may have possibly arisen from the translator regarding י, the abbreviation for יְהֹוָה, as a suffix of the first person singular. "My anger," for "the anger of the Lord," chap. xxv. 37, Hitzig and Movers think,

arose from his reading this letter again as a pronominal suffix. An example of an exactly opposite kind occurs in Jonah i. 9, where the letter was read as an abbreviation for יְהוָֹה. "An Hebrew" (עִבְרִי) in the Massoretic text, is rendered "a servant of Jehovah" in the Alexandrian version. Here, besides the abbreviation, the letter ר was also read by the Greek translator for the letter ד. In this way the variation is easily and naturally explained. Moreover, "the *four* and twentieth day" for "the *five* and twentieth day," in chap. lii. 31, may most likely have arisen from the confusion of ד with ה, the numerical signs for four and five respectively, as Hitzig also has suggested.

A seventh cause of variation was *punctuation*. The number of deviations due directly to this cause is very great. In this book alone it amounts to a few hundred. Examples, moreover, occur in every book of the Old Testament. The reason, of course, suggests itself at once. In its original form the Hebrew, as is well known, had no vowel-points, the consonants only having been written in the ancient manuscripts. Thus the mode of writing greatly increased the difficulties of translation. As the language had long ceased to be a living one, and as the version was made from an unpointed or unpunctuated text, it was inevitable that variations should occasionally occur. Without the help of

punctuation, it was impossible to decide with certainty the meaning of a word in every case. Ambiguity would necessarily arise, not only from the double signification of individual words, but also from their doubtful relation to each other. As the context often admitted of more than one rendering, the translator, without a definite notation of vowel-points, was perfectly excusable for making many divergences. The Massoretic system of punctuation, which is additional to the letters, and auxiliary both to the proper pronunciation and to the true interpretation of the language, almost wholly obviates the ancient difficulties of translation, by removing the cause of ambiguity. But even the Massorites, with all their trained acquaintance with the language, and with all their practised skill in punctuation, did not entirely avoid mistakes. A careful examination of the appended list will prove the correctness of this statement. Sometimes the one, sometimes the other, reading is superior; sometimes each one is alike good, as scholars will observe from the following examples:—

גָּלוּת—גֹּלוּת, i. 3; דְּבָרַי—דִּבְרֵי, i. 12; אַחֲרֵי—אַחֲרַי, ii. 2; יָכְלוּ—יָכִלוּ, ii. 13; שָׁבַרְתִּי—שְׁבַרְתִּי; נִתַּקְתִּי—נִתַּקְתִּי, ii. 20; קֹלָהּ—קַלָּה, ii. 23; אֶת־הָרָעוֹת—אַתְּ הֵרָעוֹת, ii. 33; בַּמַּחְתֶּרֶת—בְּמַחְתָּרֹת; אֵלֶּה—אֱלָהּ, ii. 34; תָּזֹלִי לְשַׁנּוֹת—תֵּזְלִי לְשַׁנּוֹת, ii. 36;

רעים—רֵעִים, iii. 1 ; מַקֵּל—מִקֹּל, iii. 9 ; וּתְכַסֵּנוּ—
וַתְּכַסֵּנוּ, iii. 25 ; ערלוּת—עָרְלוּת, iv. 4 ; נֵס—נָס,
iv. 21 ; להרגים—לַהֲרְגִים, iv. 31 ; רבּוּ—רְבּוּ, v. 6 ;
ואשׂבּע—וָאַשְׂבִּעַ, v. 7 ; בשׂרוֹתיה—בְּשָׁרוֹתֶיהָ, v. 10 ;
בארץ—בְּאֶרֶץ, v. 19 ; שׁבעת—שְׁבֻעַת, v. 24 ; הָעִזּוּ—
הָעֹזוּ, vi. 1 ; עצה—עֵצָה, vi. 6 ; בעמי—בְּעַמִּי, vi. 27 ;
קראוּ—קָרְאוּ, vi. 30 ; בארץ—בְּאֶרֶץ, vii. 7 ; כְּלֹה—
כָּלָה, viii. 6 ; xv. 10 ; xx. 7 ; אסיפם — אֲסִיפֵם,
viii. 13 ; שׁוֹחֵט — שָׁחֹט, ix. 7 ; לגלים — לְגַלִּים ;
יוֹשֵׁב—יוֹשֵׁב, ix. 10 ; דִּבֵּר—דְּבַר, ix. 11 ; xxiii. 17 ;
נבלת — נִבְלַת, ix. 21 ; יַעַבְרוּ — יַעֲבִרוּ, xi. 15 ;
יָפֶה — יָפֵה ; המוּלָּה — הֲמוּלָּה, xi. 16 ; הוֹדִיעַנִי —
הוֹדִיעֵנִי, xi. 18 ; ולא — וְלֹא, xi. 21 ; חַיַּת — חַיַּת ;
לאכלה — לְאָכְלָה, xii. 9 ; שְׁמָמָה — שָׁמָה ; שְׁמֵמָה —
שְׁמָמָה, xii. 11 ; זרעוּ זָרְעוּ ; קצרוּ—קָצָרוּ, xii. 13 ; שָׁמֵעוּ
—שָׁמְעוּ, xiii. 11 ; ושׁמה—וְשָׁמָּה, xiii. 16 ; כָּלָה—כְּלָה ;
הגלת—הָגְלַת, xiii. 19 ; הרע—הָרֵעַ, xiii. 23 ; אַחֲרֵי—
אַחֲרַי, xiii. 27 ; נטה—נָטָה, xiv. 8 ; מצפּוּן—מִצָּפוֹן,
xv. 12 ; ויהי—וַיְהִי, xv. 16 ; מאנה—מֵאֲנָה, xv. 18 ;
שׁררוּת—שְׁרִרוּת, xvi. 12 ; xviii. 12 ; וַהֲשִׁבוֹתִים—
וְהֲשִׁבוֹתִים, xvi. 15 ; בנבלת—בְּנִבְלַת, xvi. 18 ; בָּשָׂר—
בְּשַׂר, xvii. 5 ; ירא — יִרְאֶה, xvii. 8 ; וְאָנֻשׁ — וְאָנֻשׁ,
xvii. 9 ; אנוֹשׁ—אָנֻשׁ, xvii. 16 ; האבנים—הָאֲבָנִים,
xviii. 3 ; בידי — בְּיָדִי, xviii. 6 ; ארם — אֲרַם,

xviii. 17; בְּלָשׁוֹן — בַּלָּשׁוֹן, xviii. 18; יוֹצֵר — יוֹצֵר,
xix. 1; מַכָּתָהּ — מַכֹּתֶהָ, xix. 8; בְּמָצוֹר וּבְמָצוֹק —
בַּמָּצוֹר וּבַמָּצוֹק, xix. 9; יִשָּׁבֵר—יִשְׁבֹּר, xix. 11; לְמָגוֹר
—לְמָגוּר ; וְהִגְלָם—וְהִגְּלָם ; וְהִכָּם—וְהִכָּם, xx. 4; יְגִיעָהּ
—יְגִיעֶהָ, xx. 5; לַעַג—לַעֵג, xx. 7; רִיבָי—רִיבִי, xx. 12;
שָׂמֵחַ—שַׂמֵּחַ, xx. 15; וְהִכָּם—וְהִכָּם, xxi. 7; צוֹר—צוּר,
xxi. 13; וְכֵלָיו—וְכֵלָיו (?), xxii. 7; בַּמָּקוֹם—בְּמָקוֹם,
xxii. 12; עָשָׂה—עֲשֵׂה, xxii. 15; וְהָשְׁלַךְ—וְהַשְׁלֵךְ,
xxii. 19; אֵלֶה—אָלָה, xxiii. 10; לִמְנַאֲצַי דִּבֶּר—
לִמְנַאֲצַי דְּבַר, xxiii. 17; וּבְפַחֲזוּתָם — וּבְפַחֲזוּתָם,
xxiii. 32; לְאִישׁ — לָאִישׁ, xxiii. 36; שָׁדַד — שֹׁדֵד,
xxv. 36; בְּתוֹרָתִי — בְּתוֹרָתִי, xxvi. 4; הֶמְתְהוּ—
הֶמִתָהוּ, xxvi. 19; וַעֲבָדוֹ=וַעֲבָדָה—וַעֲבָדָהּ, xxvii. 11;
נִטְעוּ—נָטְעוּ, xxx. 6; עָם—עַם, xxxi. 2; יָלַד—יֹלֵד,
xxxi. 5; פֶּסַח—פִּסֵּחַ, xxxi. 8; יָחְדוּ—יַחְדָּו, xxxi. 13;
דְּבָרַי — דִּבְרֵי, xxxi. 20; תּוֹרָתִי — תּוֹרָתִי, xxxi. 33;
רָעַת—רָעַת, xxxii. 32; עָשָׂה—עֹשֶׂה, xxxiii. 2; וְנָבוֹא
—וַנָּבוֹא, xxxv. 11; שָׁב—שֵׁב, xxxvi. 15; וַיָּצָא—וַיֵּצֵא,
xxxvii. 4; וַיַּעֲלוּ—וַיַּעֲלוּ, xxxvii. 5; תִּשְׂאוּ—תַּשְּׂאוּ,
xxxvii. 9; תִּשָּׂרֵף—תִּשְׂרֹף, xxxviii. 23; עֵינַי—עֵינִי,
xl. 4; מַשְׂאֵת—מַשְׂאֵת, xl. 5; וַיָּשֶׁב—וַיֵּשֶׁב ; לַעֲבֹר—
לְעֵבֶר, xli. 10; גְּבָרִים—גִּבֹּרִים, xli. 16; xliii. 6;
xliv. 20; יָצָא—יֵצֵא, xliv. 17; אָמַר—אֹמֵר, xliv. 26;
תְּפַשֵּׂי—תִּפְשֵׂי, xlvi. 9; הַיּוֹנָה—הַיֹּנָה, xlvi. 16; l. 16;

קִרְאוּ שֵׁם—קָרְאוּ שָׁם, xlvi. 17; לְמִשְׁפָּט—לַמִּשְׁפָּט,
xlvi. 28; מֵאַיִן—מֵאֵין, xlviii. 9; מְהֵרָה—מִהֲרָה,
xlviii. 16; עָזְבוּ—עִזְבוּ; וְשָׁכְנוּ—וְשִׁכְנוּ, xlviii. 28;
גָּאָה—גֵּאֶה; וְרָם—וָרֻם, xlviii. 29; בְּדַיו—בַּדָּיו (?),
xlviii. 30; מִלְכֹּם—מַלְכָּם, xlix. 3; עָשׂוּ—עֵשָׂו, xlix. 8;
בַּצָּרָה—בָּצְרָה, xlix. 22; מְקַוֵּה—מִקְוֵה, l. 7; הֹדִיחוּ—
הֹדִיחוּ, l. 17; חֶרֶב—חֲרֵב, l. 21; בָּאוּ—בֹּאוּ, l. 26;
פְּרִיָּה—פָּרֶיהָ, l. 27; פְּלִיטָה—פְּלֵיטָה (?); אֶל־קְדוֹשׁ—
אֵל קְדוֹשׁ, l. 29; וְיָבֵשׁוּ—וְיֵבשׁוּ; יִתְהַלָּלוּ—יִתְהֹלָלוּ,
l. 38; אֱמֶת—אַמַּת, li. 13; נָסְכוּ—נִסְכּוֹ, li. 17;
מַעֲדָנִי—מֵעֲדָנַי, li. 34; נֵעֹרוּ—נָעֲרוּ, li. 38; מֵחֶרֶב—
מֵחֹרֶב; li. 50; נָתַן—נִתַּן, li. 55; הָרְחָבָה—הָרְחָבָה,
li. 58; עֹמֵד—עָמַד, lii. 12.

An eighth cause of variation was *dictation.* A considerable number of divergences appears to have arisen from this cause. That dictation was anciently practised in making or in transcribing manuscripts is well known. Indeed, the prophet Jeremiah practised it himself. In the beginning of chap. xxxvi., he is described as dictating his prophecies to his secretary, Baruch, who wrote them upon "a roll of a book." In like manner, it is probable that, in multiplying copies of the Scriptures, one person dictated, while another, perhaps, while several others, transcribed the

language after him. In consequence of imperfect hearing, or of indistinct pronunciation, or possibly of both, divergences would naturally occur. In the articulation of gutturals and sibilants and liquids mistakes might easily arise. Moreover, as Jeremiah's prophecies were delivered to a number of different communities, and attracted much attention at the time, many of them may have been learned by heart and afterwards orally transmitted. Recensional differences, not only of words, but also of phrases, may have arisen in this latter way. Certain classical and idiomatic expressions seem to point to oral transmission as their probable cause; for instance, such divergences as "Holy One of Israel" for "Lord," "Lord God of Hosts" for "Lord God," etc. The number of verbal variations that may be explained by dictation or by oral transmission is pretty large. In some cases, dictation seems to be the possible, in other cases, the probable, in other cases again, the unquestionable, explanation of the deviations in the version. The following examples are submitted for careful consideration :—

אֶל—עַל, i. 7, etc.; חָרְבוּ—הַרְבֵּה, ii. 12; נִצְּתָה—נִתְּצוּ, ii. 15; ix. 9; מְשָׂרֶכֶת—מַשְׂרֶקֶת, ii. 23; אֶל—עַל, ii. 27, etc.; מֵאַנְתְּ הִכָּלֵם—מֵאֵין תִּכָּלְמִי, iii. 3; הִתְקַלְקָלוּ—הִתְחַלְחָלוּ, iv. 24; נִתְּצוּ—נִצְּתוּ, iv. 26;

נוֹאֲלוּ — נוֹחֲלוּ, v. 4; הוֹתִירוּ — הָסִירוּ or הַשְׁאִירוּ, v. 10; מְשֻׁבָתָם — מַחְשְׁבֹתָם, vi. 19; נִתָּקוּ — נִתְּכָה, vi. 29; נֶאֱצַלְנוּ — נִצַּלְנוּ, vii. 10; תֹּךְ — שִׁבְתְּךָ : שֵׁב, ix. 5; אָקִים — הָקִים, xi. 5; בְּעֵת — בְּעַד, xi. 14; תַּעֲלֹזִי — תָּלוּזִי (?), xi. 15; נָשִׁיתָה — נַשְׁחִיתָה, xi. 19; וְהוֹשְׁבֹתִים — וַהֲשִׁיבֹתִים, xii. 15; xvi. 15; נִשְׁבָּה — נִשְׁבַּר, xiii. 17; נִכְמְסוּ — נֶחְמְסוּ (?), xiii. 22; נִדְהָם — נִרְדָּם, xiv. 9; מֵאָנָה אֵרָפֵא — מֵאֲנָה הֵרָפֵא, xv. 18; יַשְׁלִיךְ — יְשַׁלַּח, xvii. 8; מְשׁוּבוֹתֵינוּ — מַחְשְׁבוֹתֵינוּ, xviii. 12; יִנָּטְשׁוּ — יִנָּתְשׁוּ, xviii. 14; קָרְאוּ — כָּרוּ, xviii. 20; וְהַאֲגִרֵם — וְהַגִּרֵם, xviii. 21; וּבַקֹּתִי — וּבָקַעְתִּי (?), xix. 7; אֶצְחָק — אֶזְעָק or אֶשְׂחָק, xx. 8; הַבֹּנֶה — הוֹי בֹּנֶה, xxii. 13; בְּאָחָז — בָּאֶרֶז, xxii. 15; וַיָּנוּמוּ נוּם — וַיִּנְאֲמוּ נְאֻם, xxiii. 31; וּלְחָרְבוֹת — וּלְחֶרְפַּת, xxv. 9; הֶחָמָר — הַחֵמָה, xxv. 15; וְאַרְמוֹן — וְהֶהָמוֹן, xxx. 18; וְהִלְּלוּ — וְחִלְּלוּ, xxxi. 5; שָׁמוֹעַ — שְׁמוּעָה, xxxi. 18; סָפַדְתִּי — סָפַקְתִּי, xxxi. 19; וְנָסְעוּ — וְנִשְׂאוּ, xxxi. 24; בָּחַלְתִּי — בָּעַלְתִּי, xxxi. 32; חֲנַמְאֵל — חֲנַנְאֵל, xxxi. 38; וְאֵשׁ — וְאֵת, xxxvi. 22; פָּחֲדוּ — פָּקְדוּ (?), xxxvi. 24; וַיְשַׁלְּחֵם — וַיַּשְׁלִכֵם, xxxviii. 11; וְאָשִׁיב — וְהֵשִׁיב, xlii. 12; אֵלֵינוּ — אֱלֹהֵינוּ, xliii. 2; וְנָטָה — וְנָטַל (?), xliii. 10; וְעָטָה — וְעָדָה; יַעְטֶה — יַעֲדֶה, xliii. 12; בָּה — בָּא, xlvi. 20; תְּהִלַּת — תְּעָלַת, xlviii. 2; מְלָאָה — מַעֲלֵה, xlviii. 5; בְּמַעֲשַׂיִךְ —

בְּמָעֻזַּיִךְ, xlviii. 7; אֵיד — עֵת, xlviii. 16; וּבְנֹתֶיהָ — וּבָמֹתֶיהָ, xlix. 2; נָסוּ — נִפַּע or נִשָּׂא, xlix. 8; תְּפוּשִׁי — תָּפֹזּוּ, l. 11; הוֹי—הָיוּ, li. 2; מִזְרָקוֹת — מִזְלָגוֹת, lii. 19.

A ninth cause of variation was *derivation.* Numerous striking divergences are readily explained in this way. The combination of consonants often permitted or rendered possible a twofold etymology of a word. The Massorites derived it from one root; the translator derived it from another. Without the vowel-points, the proper root could not be known with certainty, except in so far as the context determined the sense required to be expressed. The connection, though, sometimes left room for ambiguity. Hence deviations would naturally arise for which the Greek translator was not justly responsible. Whether he was well or ill acquainted with the classic Hebrew, there is reason to believe that he was well acquainted with the kindred Aramaic. With this latter he may have been almost as familiar as with his mother tongue. That the derivation of Hebrew words at the time of the translation of the Septuagint was more doubtful than during the days of the Massorites is questionable; that it was more difficult before the punctuation was fixed by the insertion of the diacritic

points than afterwards is unquestionable. This latter fact should be borne in mind, not so much to palliate the translator's errors, as to extenuate the faults of his translation, by showing that he was neither culpably nor carelessly to blame for them. Not only was his derivation in every case permissible, but also it was in several cases preferable. From the following list it will be seen that, in a few instances, a variation arose from a substitution of letters in connection with a different derivation of a word:—

נפח—פתח, i. 14; יכל—כול, ii. 13; אשש—יאש, ii. 25; xviii. 12; זלל—אזל, ii. 36; ישב—שבב, iii. 6; viii. 12; קלל—קול, iii. 9; נוס—נסס, iv. 6, 21; צרר—נצר, iv. 16; זנה—זון or יזן, v. 8; עזז—עת, vi. 1; כלה—כול, vi. 11; אצל—נצל, vii. 10; ספה or אסף—יסף, vii. 21; דמה—דמן, viii. 2; ix. 21; xvi. 4; שבב—שוב, viii. 4; כלה—כלל, viii. 6; xv. 10; xx. 7; גלה—גלל, ix. 10; מול—המל, xi. 16; נחל—חלה, xii. 13; ישב—שוב, xii. 15; xvi. 15; xxiii. 3; פרץ—נפץ, xiii. 14; li. 20 *seq.;* אנה—מאן, xv. 18; חוס—חסה, xvii. 17; שיח—שחה, xviii. 20, 22; גוד—נגד or גדד, xx. 10; יצת—יצא, xxi. 12; נחת—חתת, xxi. 13; רעה—רעע, xxii. 22; שוב—ישב, xxiii. 8; נום—נאם, xxiii. 31; נשא—נשה, xxiii. 39; יעל—עלה, xxx. 13; עוד—יעד, xxx. 20; חדה—יחד, xxxi. 13; נוח—נחם, xxxi. 15; xlii. 10; ראה—ירא,

xxxii. 21; נשא—נשׂא, xxxvii. 9; שוב—שבה, xli. 10; דמם—דמן, xlviii. 2; בוש—יבש, l. 38; עור—נער, li. 38; מנח—נוח, li. 59.

A tenth cause of variation was *word-division.* The illustrations of this kind of deviation are exceedingly interesting. Here again the discrepancy was partly due to absence of punctuation. It was also partly due to the ancient custom of writing Hebrew words without any divisions between them, either in the form of spaces or of points. Had the consonants been punctuated, or had the words been separated, variations of this sort might have been avoided; but, as the letters were unpunctuated, and written close together without any marks or signs to separate between them, it is only natural that divergences should have arisen from this cause. It is no wonder, therefore, that the translator, with nothing to guide him but the connection in which they stood, should have divided some words differently from the way in which they were divided by the Massorites. Even the latter have not always hit upon the best division which the construction of a passage properly and logically required. It seems very probable that, in every endeavour to translate an ancient unpointed manuscript, some divergences would inevitably arise; so that, after the Hebrew

ceased to be a spoken language, no two renderings of an entire book would be in all respects alike. Some of the variations due to word-division in this book afford excellent sense. In certain instances, as the following list will show, the reading in the Greek is better than the reading in the Hebrew :—

אַתְּ צֹעָה — אֶתְצָעֶה=אֶצְטָעָה, ii. 20; הַדּוֹר אַתֶּם — וְלֹא יֵרָאתֶם, ii. 31; לָכֵן — לֹא־כֵן, ii. 33; רְבִבִים — רֹעִים רַבִּים; מֵאַנְתְּ הִכָּלֵם — מֵאֵין תִּכָּלְמִי, iii. 3; עֲרָבוֹת — עַד־בַּיִת, v. 6; מַבְלִיגִיתִי — מִבְּלִי־גֵהָה (?), viii. 18; שִׁבְתְּךָ — תֹּךְ : שֹׁב, ix. 5; מֵחֲרוֹן אַף — מְחָרֵף, xii. 13; עֹשֶׂר וְלֹא — עָשְׂרוּ לֹא, xvii. 11; בִּנְיָמִן — בִּנְיָן מִמְּנֶה (?), xx. 2; הַבֹּנֶה — הוֹי בֹּנֶה, xxii. 13; מֵעֲבָרִים — מֵעֵבֶר־יָם, xxii. 20; הַאֱלֹהֵי מִקָּרֹב — אֱלֹהִים קָרֹב, xxiii. 23; אַתֶּם הַמַּשָּׂא — אֶת־מַה־מַּשָּׂא, xxiii. 33; לְהַרְגִּיעוֹ — וְלֹא הָרְגוּ, xxxi. 2; בָּם עִוֵּר — בְּמוֹעֵד, xxxi. 8; גְּדַלְיָהוּ — (הָיָה) גָּדֹל הוּא, xli. 9; נִסְחַף — נָס(מִ)מְּךָ, xlvi. 15; עַד יָם יַעְזֵר — עָרֵי מִיַּעְזֵר, xlviii. 32; עַד־יַהַץ — עָרֵיהֶם, xlviii. 34; בְּדֵי־אֵשׁ — בָּרֹאשׁ, li. 58.

An eleventh cause of variation was *word-composition.* A surprising number of deviations may be explained by difference of spelling. The vowel-letters י and ו, which, before the Massoretic system of notation was invented, to some extent supplied

the place of the vowels ī and ē, ō and ū, were not employed so frequently in ancient as in modern times. The truth of this statement is illustrated by the marked tendency to their more frequent employment, which is manifest in the later books of the Old Testament. Even in the earlier books, the usage is by no means uniform. The writing of some words was almost invariable; the writing of others was very variable. In the same book, too, the usage fluctuates. Had these letters been always written in the translator's manuscript where they are now written in the Hebrew text, many significant deviations could not have occurred. The absence of the one or the other of these letters, and sometimes of both of them, as in chaps. xlix. 20; l. 13, explains such variations perfectly. An examination of each list of illustrations given will show that the Greek again, in many places, presents the preferable reading.

The following passages are submitted as examples of cases where *Waw* was wanting in the ancient manuscripts:—

ו. וּלְחֹמַת—וּלְחֹמֹת = וּלְחֹמוֹת, i. 18; יָכֹלוּ—יְכָלוּ = יוּכְלוּ, ii. 13; קַלָּה—קֹלָה = קוֹלָה, ii. 23; בַּמַּחְתֶּרֶת—בַּמַּחְתָּרֹת = בַּמַּחְתָּרוֹת, ii. 34; עָרְלַת—עָרְלֹת = עָרְלוֹת, iv. 4; נֵס—נָסוּ = נוּסוּ, iv. 6; חֻקַּת—חֻקֹּת = חֻקּוֹת, v. 24; בָּמַת—בָּמֹת = בָּמוֹת, vii. 31;

שׁוּב : תּוֹךְ = שָׁב : תֹּךְ—שִׁבְתְּךָ, ix. 5 ; נִבְלֹת — נִבְלַת
= נִבְלוֹת, ix. 21 ; עָשְׂתָה—עֲשֹׂתָה = עֲשׂוּתָהּ, xi. 15;
חֲיוֹת = חַיֹּת — חַיַּת, xii. 9 ; xxvii. 6 ; בַּצָּרוֹת =
בַּצָּרֶת—בַּצָּרֹת or בַּצֹּרֶת, xiv. 1 ; אַיֶּלֶת — אַיָּלֹת =
אַיָּלוֹת, xiv. 5 ; כְּאֶזְרָח (ו ∞ ז) — כְּאוֹרֵחַ = כְּאֹרֵחַ,
xiv. 8 ; כְּגֶבֶר—כְּגִבֹּר = כְּגִבּוֹר, xiv. 9 ; וְהִגְלָם—
וְהִכּוֹם = וְהִכֹּם — וְהִכָּם ; וְהִגְלוֹם = וְהִגְלָם, xx. 4 ;
מְזִמַּת — מְזִמֹּת = מְזִמּוֹת, xxiii. 20 ; מִשְׁפְּחוֹת =
מִשְׁפַּחַת—מִשְׁפְּחֹת, xxv. 9 ; xxx. 25 ; לְשִׁמְמוֹת =
לְשִׁמְמַת—לְשִׁמְמֹת, xxv. 12 ; בְּתוֹרָתִי—בְּתוֹרֹתַי =
בְּתוֹרוֹתַי, xxvi. 4 ; מַחֲשֶׁבֶת—מַחְשְׁבֹת = מַחְשְׁבוֹת,
xxix. 11; li. 29 ; תּוֹעָלָה = תְּעָלָה—תּעָלָה, xxx. 13;
בִּקְהַל—בִּמְחֹל = בִּמְחוֹל (?), xxxi. 4, 13 ; תּוֹרָתִי—
תּוֹרוֹתַי = תּוֹרֹתַי, xxxi. 33 ; עַד — עֹד = עוֹד, xxxi.
39 ; יֵלֵךְ—יֹלֵךְ = יוֹלֵךְ, xxxii. 5 ; וּבְמֹרָא = וּבְמוֹרָא—
וּבְמַרְאִים, xxxii. 21 ; רָעוֹת=רָעֹת—רָעַת, xxxii. 32 ;
שׁוּב = שָׁב — שֵׁב, xxxvi. 15 ; הָאוֹצָר = הָאֹצָר —
(∞) הָאָרֶץ, xxxviii. 11 ; מַשְׂאוֹת = מַשְׂאֹת—מַשְׂאֵת,
xl. 5 ; יִתַּמּוּ (∞) יָמֻתוּ=יָמוּתוּ, xlii. 17 ; תָּמֻתוּ=תְּמוּתוּ
—(∞) תִּתַּמּוּ, xlii. 22 ; שָׁדַד—שֹׁדֵד = שׁוֹדֵד, xlviii. 18 ;
שָׁלַח — שָׁלֻחַ = שָׁלוּחַ, xlix. 14 ; וּמַחְשְׁבוֹתָיו =
וּמַחְשַׁבְתּוֹ — וּמַחְשְׁבֹתָו, xlix. 20 ; חָצֹר = חָצוֹר —
חָצֵר, xlix. 28, 30, 33 ; תָּפֹזּוּ (∞)—תָּפְשׂוּ = תְּפוּשׂוּ,
l. 11 ; מַכָּתָהּ—מַכֹּתֶהָ = מַכּוֹתֶיהָ, l. 13 ; זֹרֵעַ = זוֹרֵעַ

—זֶרַע, l. 16 ; נֵעֹרוּ—נָעֲרוּ = נֵעוֹרוּ, li. 38 ; חֹמוֹת =
חֹמֹת—חֹמַת, li. 58 ; מְנוּחָה = מְנֻחָה—מִנְחָה, li. 59.

The following are examples of cases where *Yod* was absent from the ancient manuscripts :—

י· כַּעֲרָבִי = כַּעֲרָב—כָּעֹרֵב, iii. 2 ; שְׁפָיִם = שְׁפָם—שָׁפָם
(שְׁפָתַיִם), iii. 21; vii. 29 ; וְאֵין = וְאֵן—וְאָן, vi. 14 ;
בַּנֹּפְלִים = בַּנֹּפְלִם—בְּנָפְלָם, vi. 15 ; כְּאִישׁ = כְּאִשׁ—
כְּאֵשׁ, vi. 23; l. 42; מַשְׁחִיתִם = מַשְׁחִתִים—מָשְׁחָתִים,
vi. 28 ; מוֹעֲדֶיהָ = מוֹעֲדֶהָ—מוֹעֲדָהּ, viii. 7 ; רְבִיבִים
= רְבִבִם—רְבִיבָם, xiv. 22; אֵיךְ = אֵךְ—אַךְ, xvi. 19;
זָרִים = זָרִם—זֵרִם, xviii. 14 ; מִכְשָׁלִים = מִכְשָׁלִם—
מִכְשֹׁלָם, xviii. 23 ; יְגִיעֶיהָ = יְגִיעֶהָ—יְגִיעָהּ, xx. 5 ;
צַדִּיק = צַדִּק—צֶדֶק, xx. 12 ; דְּבָרֶיךָ = דְּבָרֶךָ—דְּבָרְךָ,
xxviii. 6 ; אַדִּירוֹ — אַדִּירָו = אַדִּירָיו, xxx. 21 ;
כִּדְרָכָיו = כִּדְרָכָו—כְּדַרְכּוֹ, xxxii. 19; וּבְיָדוֹ — וּבְיָדָו =
וּבְיָדָיו, xxxiv. 3 ; אֵיךְ = אֵךְ (ן∞ך)—אָן, xxxvi. 17;
הוֹתִיר = הוֹתִר — הַוֹּתֵר, xliv. 7 ; אֹיְבָיו = אֹיְבָו —
אֹיְבוֹ, xliv. 30 ; מְהִירָה = מְהִרָה—מְהֵרָה, xlviii. 16 ;
אֵלֶיהָ = אֵלֶהָ—אֵלֶּה, xlviii. 44 ; יִתְמֶיךָ = יִתְמֶךָ—
יְתֹמְךָ, xlix. 11 ; וּמַחְשְׁבוֹתָיו = וּמַחְשְׁבֹתָו—וּמַחֲשַׁבְתּוֹ;
יַשִּׁים = יַשִּׁם — יֵשַׁם, xlix. 20 ; שׁוֹבְבִים = שׁוֹבְבִם —
שׁוֹבְבֵם, l. 6 ; מַכּוֹתֶיהָ = מַכֹּתֶהָ — מַכָּתָהּ, l. 13 ;
עִצְּמוֹ—עִצְּמָו = עֲצָמָיו, l. 17 ; כְּפָעֳלֶיהָ = כְּפָעֳלֶהָ—כְּפָעֳלָהּ

כְּפָעֳלֶיהָ, l. 29 ; פְּקֻדָּתֶיהָ = פְּקֻדָּתֵהּ — פְּקָדְתֵּךְ (or פְּקֻדָּתֵךְ), l. 31 ; מַפֵּץ—מְפִץ = מֵפִיץ, li. 20.

A twelfth cause of variation was *word-signification.* There are many passages that furnish apparent evidence of this kind. Several words or expressions, whose ordinary meaning the translator must have known, seem once to have possessed a signification that has disappeared ; or, at least, that has not been retained in translating the Massoretic text. It is not unreasonable to suppose that many words had meanings formerly which do not appear in modern Hebrew lexicons. It is also not improbable that the translators of the Septuagint may have been acquainted with ancient significations with which the Massorites were unacquainted. Some indications also occur of Aramaic influence. As Knobel[1] has discussed the Chaldaisms or Aramaisms in the Massoretic text, it is unnecessary to refer to them in this discussion. It should be observed, however, that a still greater Aramaic colouring is apparent in the Alexandrian text. In chap. xv. 18, for instance, where the verb נָצַח is rendered "overcome" in Greek, the meaning expressed is rather Aramaic than Hebrew. In chap. l. 42, where the verb חָזַק is translated "having" in the Septuagint, either the texts were

[1] *Jeremias Chaldaizans*, MDCCCXXXI.

different, or this verb was then given its ordinary Aramaic meaning of having or possessing. A few other instances naturally suggest either Aramaic meanings, or meanings of words in earlier times that in later times were either overlooked or lost. The following may be given as examples of possible Aramaic significations :—

אִם — הֵן (הִן), iii. 1; יִמְחֲאוּ — יִרְדּוּ (יִרְדּוּ), v. 31; עֹבְדֵהוּ—עֶבְרָתוֹ (עֲבָדָתוּ), vii. 29; אוֹר—רוּחַ (אֲוֵר), x. 13; li. 16; עֲבוֹד—עֲבוּר (עִבּוּד), xiv. 4; אֵלֶּה—אֲבֵלָה (אֱלְיָה), xxxi. 21; שָׁב—שֵׁב (תּוּב), xxxvi. 15.

A thirteenth cause of variation was *Greek-transmission.* Some deviations were undoubtedly due to errors in copying the Greek manuscripts. Examples of such mistakes in copying the ancient Hebrew manuscripts have been already noted. Although this is a similar cause of variation, the principle has a particular application, and, therefore, claims a separate consideration. In order to determine accurately how much the manuscripts of the Septuagint have suffered by transmission in this way, in addition to examining them carefully, it is necessary to compare the ancient and modern characters in which they have been written. Such an undertaking involves a special investigation of itself, and does not belong directly to the present

discussion. In the work of retranslation, though, a number of instances have been met that prove that many variations may be adequately explained by applying this principle, as well to the Greek as to the Hebrew manuscripts. An application of the principle to all the books of the Old Testament would be interesting; and, if not fruitful, the results, at least, would be important. A few of the more probable examples occurring in this book, some of which were long ago suggested by Schleusner in his *Thesaurus*, may be given here. The following possible cases will be sufficient for the present purpose:—

ἀναστροφῆς for *ἀποστροφῆς*, vi. 19; *κατευθηνόντων* for *κατευθυνόντων*, xv. 11; *μαναά* for *μάννα*, xvii. 26; *μήτηρ* for *μήτρη*, xx. 17; *ναός* for *λαός*, xxx. 18; *ἐπὶ μεροῦ* for *ἐφ' ἡμέρας*, xxxi. 19; *οἴμους* for *ὤμους*, xxxi. 21; *ὦ ἀδών* for *ἕως ἅδου*, xxxiv. 5; *χενέθ* for *χερέθ*, xxxvii. 16; *γῆς* for *τῆς*, xlvi. 27; *ἡ πτοητός* for *ἡ ἀπτόητος*, l. 2; *ἐν σοί* for *ἐκ σοῦ*, li. 20; *σκεῦος* for *σκότος*, li. 34.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CHARACTER OF THE TRANSLATION.

It has been frequently asserted, and is at present commonly believed, that the Alexandrian version of the Old Testament has been very unequally translated. The translation of the Pentateuch and of the historic books has been considered tolerably accurate and trustworthy, but the translation of the poetic and prophetic books has been considered utterly inaccurate and untrustworthy. Owing to the number and the nature of the deviations, in these latter books particularly, the translators of them are believed to have allowed themselves to take all sorts of liberties with their text. They are supposed, as has been shown, to have abridged it, amplified it, modified it, and, in many ways and places, falsified it. In short, by implication, they have been accredited with having done everything but honest work, and with having been anything but honourable men.

Because of its alleged inaccuracy and incorrectness, a poor opinion of the Septuagint has hitherto prevailed. It still prevails, too, as a deeply-rooted

prejudice. This prejudice is chiefly, if not wholly, due to the acceptance of a false hypothesis respecting the character and the causes of the manifold divergences. It has been almost universally believed that both the Greek and Hebrew must and could be traced back to the same original manuscripts. This fact affords the reason why so many and such inconsistent theories have been suggested for the purpose of accounting for the enormous number of deviations in this book. On no other supposition, could the charge of arbitrariness have been received with so much favour in such numerous and unexpected quarters. Had the true nature and origin of the variations been adequately understood, the unworthy views, so widely prevalent, would long ago have been rejected. Indeed, they would never have been seriously entertained.

The general character of the translation of this particular book has been already noticed in dealing with the various classes of divergency that everywhere abound. Some of its chief features also have been briefly indicated. These, however, need to be more thoroughly discussed. It is particularly necessary to ascertain, as accurately as possible, the exact character of the translation, for the sake of showing its real importance for purposes of text-criticism. We have nothing to do at present with

the condition of the Alexandrian text itself. That is a separate subject of investigation. Apart from the condition of this text, the critical value of the Septuagint depends essentially upon two things—the nature of the Greek translation, and the nature of the Hebrew manuscript from which it has been made. If the translation bears indications of fidelity and care, and if the manuscript shows evidences of purity and age, the testimony of the version is entitled to the greatest possible regard.

The first important feature of the translation is its *literalness.* This feature applies in general to the whole work. The narrative portions, though, it will be found, have been more accurately rendered than have the poetic portions, of the book. The difference, which is very perceptible, is significant. It admits, however, of a rational explanation. While partly due to imperfection or corruption in the ancient manuscripts, it was largely, if not chiefly, due to the greater perplexity that was experienced in translating poetry than was experienced in translating prose, from an unpointed text. The absence of punctuation would naturally render the work of reproducing the striking figures peculiar to the Hebrew particularly difficult. Competent critics will readily appreciate this statement. Unprejudiced observers, too, on carefully examining the

Hebrew text itself, will find that the same difficulty was also experienced by the Massorites.

Whatever may be thought or shown by scholars to be the case with reference to the other prophetic books, this book has been translated with the utmost carefulness. As a rule, wherever the originals of the two texts were the same, the Greek exactly reproduces the present Hebrew text; and wherever the original of the one was different from that of the other, the Greek accurately represents a classic Hebrew text. The whole book indicates that this text originally was very carefully translated. So far as the condition of the ancient manuscript admitted, the work was unquestionably well done. Not merely is the translation literal, but the literalness extends to the order of the words, often of the smallest particles, in the sentences. Of page after page, and chapter after chapter, this is true. The most peculiar constructions, moreover, are scrupulously reproduced. No modern English or German version of the book, it is not too much to say, is nearly so literal in all respects as is the Alexandrian version.

Indeed, so slavishly literal is the translation, and so accurately does it represent the Hebrew idiom, that the Greek, when retranslated into the original, takes at once the Hebrew form. Even the legitimate license of translation has been most sparingly em-

ployed. The translator very often did not use it when the genius of his language warranted its use. In short, the work is Hebraized, the Greek style having been sacrificed to the Hebrew style. Were it necessary, innumerable examples might be given. One needs, however, only to examine the translation to observe that it frequently adheres too closely to the original to be tolerable Greek. The almost exact correspondence of the Greek to the Hebrew form may be proved by practical experiment. The greater portion of the version can be literally translated back into classic Hebrew, with scarcely any change whatever in the present order of the words. From these considerations, one may say with Scholz, "A translation which follows the original from word to word, even where the language in which it is translated is opposed, must be regarded as a translation in the strictest sense of the term."[1]

The second feature of the translation is its *faithfulness.* This characteristic is specially illustrated in the case of Hebraisms, a few examples of which have been given in another place. An instance now and then occurs in which an idiom of this kind

[1] "Eine Uebersetzung, die von Wort zu Wort, selbst wo die Sprache, in welche übersetzt wird, widerstrebt, dem Originale nachgeht, muss als eine Uebersetzung im strengsten Sinne des Wortes angesehen werden." *Der masoreth. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung,* etc., p. 22.

is wanting in the Septuagint. Whenever this is the case, then either the original manuscript did not contain it, or it has accidentally disappeared in the process of transmission. The translator was in no respect responsible for the omission,—firstly, because of the simplicity of the construction; secondly, because of the fact that such idioms are frequently translated by him; and, thirdly, because of the still more significant fact, that such idioms are sometimes present in the Alexandrian, where they are absent from the Massoretic, text. For these reasons it is evident, not only that he understood such peculiarly idiomatic Hebrew forms, but also that he faithfully reproduced them whenever he found them.

In his acute but incomplete discussion of the relation between the Greek and Hebrew of this book, Movers long since directed attention to this feature of the translation. Although he has made some observations upon its significance, he has pointed out but one passage where a Hebraism of this kind occurs only in the Septuagint. As has been shown, however, it occurs in several passages. A single instance, perhaps, would not be thought sufficient to establish with certainty the character of such a variation. Were there not more than one example, it might with reason be suggested that the idiom had accidentally disappeared from the

Massoretic text. The number, though, renders the suggestion worthless. In nearly every case, moreover, the examples occur along with other deviations which indicate their nature past all peradventure. They can be nothing other than recensional divergences. It is inconceivable that the translator invented them, or that he at any time introduced expressions foreign to the Greek language, where his original gave him no occasion for it. These Hebraisms in themselves furnish incontrovertible proof of a special text-recension. In no other way is it possible adequately to account for them. In addition to the direct testimony they bear in support of this hypothesis, they also prove conclusively the great fidelity with which the translator did his work.

Besides the repeated occurrence of this special kind of idiom in the Alexandrian, where it is wanting in the Massoretic, text, other idiomatic expressions peculiar to the Hebrew also frequently occur. One of the most remarkable idioms of the Jewish language is the employment of a Waw Conversive or Consecutive to modify the meaning of a primary tense. Notwithstanding the apparently arbitrary character of this idiom, which was not only foreign to the Greek, but also incapable of being adequately transferred to that or to any other language, it, nevertheless, was reproduced with almost painful

accuracy. So faithfully was the work performed, that this idiom appears in many places only in the Septuagint. The version often has it where the Hebrew has it not. But one explanation can be given of this fact. The idiom belonged to the translator's manuscript, and was conscientiously retained. On this point, again, Scholz's observation is pertinent and important. After showing fully how the Greek sentences generally bear unmistakably the type of the Hebrew language, he says, "To this it may be added, that a number of short words which stand only in the Greek text are Hebraisms. On Greek ground these cannot have come into the text. On the contrary, a translator, whose only aim was to make his readers acquainted with the contents of the book, would have had every reason to omit, for instance, the ו as sign of the apodosis or consequent clause. That he does not do it, is to us a further proof of the scrupulous exactness of his work."[1]

The third feature of the translation is its *purity*. This feature refers to the original of the Greek.

[1] "Hiezu kommt noch, dass eine Anzahl der im griechischen Texte mehr stehenden Wörtchen Hebraismen sind. Auf hellenistischem Boden können diese nicht in den Text gekommen sein. Im Gegentheil hätte ein Uebersetzer, dem es nur darum zu thun war, seine Leser mit dem Inhalte des Buches bekannt zu machen, allen Grund gehabt, z. B. ו als Zeichen des Nachsatzes wegzulassen. Dass er es nicht thut, ist uns ein weiterer Beweis der scrupulösen Genauigkeit seines Werkes." *Der masoreth. Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung*, etc., p. 109.

As elsewhere indicated, there are frequent traces in the Massoretic text of a systematic revision of this book. In certain parts, the indications are not simply striking but decisive, the original text seeming to have been extensively enlarged or amplified. As illustrations of this influence have been given in another place, it is superfluous either to repeat them or to multiply them. Bleek's judgment on this point, though, is so important and so just, that it deserves to be quoted here in full. "When we impartially consider the individual variations of both texts," he says, "it can be determined from internal grounds, in many cases, with the greatest degree of probability, that, in these cases, the Alexandrian recension gives us still the original text, the Massoretic recension one somewhat revised. This is primarily the case respecting rather longer passages which the Massoretic text has, but which the Septuagint has not, where, throughout, it is much more likely that the same are later additions, than that, belonging originally to the text, they should have been omitted by later transcribers or compilers."[1]

[1] "Wenn wir die einzelnen Abweichungen beider Texte unbefangen betrachten, so lässt sich nach inneren Gründen in vielen Fällen mit dem grössten Grade von Wahrscheinlichkeit urtheilen, dass hier die Alexandrinische Recension uns noch den ursprünglichen Text liefert, die masorethische einen etwas überarbeiteten. Dies gilt zuvörderst in Bezug auf etwas grössere Stellen, welche der masorethische Text hat, nicht aber die Sept., wo überall viel wahrscheinlicher ist, dass

As the custom of text-revision was long and widely practised, this book may have been repeatedly revised. For such a custom there is ample authority, and for such a probability there is abundant evidence. The habit of re-editing and recasting Scripture, which may have begun, perhaps, with Ezra or Nehemiah, appears to have survived till tolerably modern times. Referring to this practice of revising ancient Hebrew writings, which, whenever it commenced, prevailed for many centuries amongst Jewish scholars or literati, Dr. Edersheim observes, "There are scarcely any ancient Rabbinical documents which have not been interpolated by later writers, or, as we might euphemistically call it, been recast and re-edited." [1] The activity and influence of these later Scripture revisers are becoming more universally acknowledged every year. Even Ryssel, in his recent able but conservative work on the text of Micah, admits the remarkable progress of this opinion amongst impartial critics, particularly since the time of Hitzig.[2] Moreover, he quotes, with apparent approbation, the words of Cheyne in his valuable commentary

dieselben spätere Zusätze sind, als dass sie, dem Text ursprünglich angehörend, sollten durch spätere Abschreiber oder Sammler ausgelassen sein." *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 321.

[1] *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, p. 131. (Quoted from Cheyne on Isaiah.)

[2] *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt und die Echtheit des Buches Micha*, p. 223.

on the book of Isaiah, where the latter of the Massoretic text significantly asserts, "It is becoming more and more certain that the present form, especially of the prophetic Scriptures, is due to a literary class (the so-called Soferim, 'scribes' or 'scripturists'), whose principal function was collecting and supplementing the scattered records of prophetic revelation."[1]

The fourth feature of the translation is its *priority*. This feature, like the preceding one, applies particularly to the manuscript from which the version was translated. By the priority of the translation, therefore, is meant the priority of the text from which it was made, as compared with the present Massoretic text. In general, the Greek presents the earlier and the more original form of the book. Paragraph after paragraph might be indicated in support of this assertion. The priority of many passages is admitted by Hitzig; the originality of a few is admitted even by Graf himself. While it is not advisable to multiply examples, there is one group of chapters, namely, xxvii.-xxix., which claims, in this connection, some consideration. The differences between the two texts in these chapters are remarkable, as well as manifold. Graf evidently either did not see, or did not want to see, that, in these chapters, the devia-

[1] *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, vol. ii., third edition, p. 228.

tions are, in some respects, more striking than they are in any other portion of the book. The peculiarities appear, not only in the frequency, but also in the form of the divergences. Movers, Bleek, and Hitzig have so thoroughly discussed them, that it is scarcely more than necessary here to indicate some of the more singular of them. The style is manifestly more than usually diffuse, even for Jeremiah, and differs very considerably from the prophet's ordinary mode of speech.

On examination, it will be observed that the title, "the prophet," occurs continually in connection with the name of the person of that office mentioned, and is in nearly every place superfluous. The spelling also, as well as the language, is peculiar. This is the case especially with proper names, compounded with Jehovah, which have both a longer and a shorter ending. As a rule, throughout this book the longer form prevails; in this group of chapters, though, the shorter form generally occurs. With only four exceptions, chaps. xxviii. 12; xxix. 27, 29, 30, the name of "Jeremiah" here has the shorter ending, whereas it elsewhere always has the longer ending. The same exceptional ending also here appears in other proper names; as, for instance, "Zedekiah," chaps. xxvii. 12; xxviii. 1; xxix. 3; "Jeconiah," chaps.

xxvii. 20; xxviii. 4; xxix. 2; "Hananiah," chap. xxviii. 1, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17. A striking difference, too, appears in the spelling of the name of "Nebuchadnezzar." In the book of Jeremiah, it is generally written with the letter *r;* but, in these three chapters, it is frequently written with the letter *n.* Such peculiar features, taken together with the numerous unnecessary additions to the Hebrew, consisting of words, phrases, half-verses, whole verses, and an entire paragraph, naturally point to only one conclusion — a conclusion which Kühl has the candour to admit. His admission is the more significant, inasmuch as he, in general, has adopted and defended Graf's hypothesis. After pointing out the chief peculiarities here, which clearly indicate a later redaction or revision, he observes, "The text of the Septuagint, in these chapters, is, if not exactly like the original text, yet much more nearly like it than the Massoretic text is." [1]

The fifth feature of the translation is its *superiority.* This feature again applies, of course, to the original of the version. The Septuagint presents not only a purer and an earlier, but also a superior, form of the book. The Greek generally

[1] "Der Text der LXX. steht also dem ursprünglichen Texte in diesen Kapiteln, wenn auch nicht ganz gleich, so doch bedeutend näher als der massoretische Text." *Das Verhältniss der Massora zur Septuaginta,* etc., p. 63.

exhibits a shorter and, in many respects, a better text than the Hebrew exhibits. The original of the version was tolerably, if not entirely, free from glosses. Hitzig believes that it was a text, as yet, not amplified or glossed at all. Whether, as he supposes, the process of interpolation had not commenced at the time of the translation has not been definitely determined. One thing, at least, is certain, the interpolations in the Hebrew are vastly greater than they are in the Greek. The Massoretic text, moreover, as has been frequently and fully evinced, abounds in superfluities, redundances, and useless or unnecessary repetitions of various kinds. The text which the Septuagint represents, on the other hand, is concise and admirable. In contrast to the former, which is remarkably verbose and pleonastic, the latter is exceedingly brief and terse. These differences were unquestionably recensional. While it is improper to suppose, with some, that all that the Massoretic text has more than the Alexandrian is pure interpolation, it is proper to suppose that much of it is. The characteristic brevity and conciseness of the Septuagint are so manifestly textual, and so clearly indicative of age and originality, that their significance in these respects can scarcely be overestimated. "The translator," as another has said, "has had before him a more

concise and excellent text, and, therefore, in all difficult critical questions of dispute, one must take the final verdict of the Septuagint."[1] Should this last statement seem too strong, it is safe, at least, to say that the Greek should everywhere be consulted in translating the Hebrew of this prophetic book.

Besides these excellences of the Septuagint in respect to style, its superiority of text in many passages has been admitted by several distinguished critics. Even Graf sometimes makes such an admission. Movers, Michaelis, and de Wette, though, give a decided preference to the Alexandrian version. Hitzig also frequently acknowledges the originality or superiority of the reading in the Septuagint. In some cases, the Greek exhibits a more complete, in some cases, a more classic, in some cases, a more suitable reading than the Hebrew. In other cases, the form in Greek is preferable to the form in Hebrew, because it is the more natural. In other cases, again, the superiority of the former to the latter is proved by parallel passages. By a critical comparison, the reason for the preference in each case, it is thought, will be at once apparent. A

[1] "Der Uebersetzer habe einen kürzern, vortrefflicheren Text vor sich gehabt, und man müsse demnach in allen schwierigen kritischen Streitfragen den letzten Entscheid von der Septuaginta holen." (Quoted from Kühl's Monograph.)

few interesting and striking examples of superior text, which all impartial scholars must admit, may now be pointed out. These are taken simply from the first few chapters. As the complete list with references and parallel passages appears in the Conspectus at the end of the book, the following only need be given here :—" The word of Jehovah which was to Jeremiah" for "The words of Jeremiah," chap. i. 1 ; "fear not before them and be not dismayed at them, for I am with thee to deliver thee, declares Jehovah," for "be not dismayed at them, lest I dismay thee before them," chap. i. 17 ; "thou hast broken thy yoke, and burst thy bands," for "I have broken thy yoke, and burst thy bands," chap. ii. 20 ; "wherefore do ye speak to me ?" for "wherefore will ye plead with me ?" chap. ii. 29 ; "thou hast not obeyed" for "ye have not obeyed," chap. iii. 13 ; "the ark of the covenant of the Holy One of Israel" for "the ark of the covenant of the Lord," chap. iii. 16 ; "from the north country and from all the countries" for "from the land of the north," chap. iii. 18 ; "if he will put away his abominations from his mouth" for "if thou wilt put away thine abominations out of my sight," chap. iv. 1 ; "in him shall they praise God at Jerusalem" for "in him shall they glory," chap. iv. 2 ; "behold, they are coming" for "behold," chap. iv. 16 ; "the

P

cities were burned with fire" for "the cities thereof were broken down," chap. iv. 26; "leave under her foundations, because they are Jehovah's" for "take away her branches, for they are not the Lord's," chap. v. 10, etc.

Thus, in these five respects, the translation is shown to possess the highest possible merit. Each feature indicated is favourable to the Septuagint, or rather to the Alexandrian recension from which it was translated. A further proof of its excellence is furnished by the evidence of other translations of the book, namely, the Latin, the Syriac, and the Aramaic versions. This evidence is so important that it must not be neglected, although it is not expedient to discuss it fully, because the subject does not belong to this investigation. In a considerable number of passages, both the Latin and the Syriac versions, or the Vulgate and the Peshitto, as they are called respectively, agree with the Septuagint against the Massoretic text. As Scholz has pointed out these passages, it is unnecessary to indicate them here. The testimony of the Vulgate is most significant, because, as it is supposed, with the exception of the book of Psalms, it was translated independently of the Septuagint from a Hebrew text. The testimony of the Peshitto is very interesting, because, as it is believed, it was translated partly from the Hebrew

and partly from the Greek. Whenever the Syriac agrees with the Greek and Latin against the Hebrew, the translator must have thought the reading of these versions better than the reading of the Hebrew text.

The superiority of the Septuagint is still further shown by the evidence afforded by the Aramaic version. Although this version is a Targum, or a free interpretation, and not a literal translation, yet its testimony indicates how very many divergent passages were understood at the time that it was made. As in the case of the other versions, a full consideration of the evidence does not belong to this discussion. In comparing the Greek and Hebrew, though, it has been thought important also to compare both of them with the Aramaic; and, as the results are very valuable, to indicate them in the Conspectus of the variations at the end of the work. On examining the results of the comparison, the examples will show that, in some passages, by the words given, in other passages, by the sense expressed, the Aramaic agrees with the Greek against the Hebrew. By comparing these results, moreover, with those of Scholz, or by comparing the individual texts themselves, it will be seen that sometimes one, sometimes two, and sometimes three of these ancient versions agree with the Greek, and disagreè with the Hebrew.

This fact speaks for itself. Where the Latin, the Greek, the Syriac, and the Aramaic correspond, their combined testimony becomes practically indisputable, and furnishes an overwhelming argument in favour of the Septuagint.

CHAPTER IX.

THE RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATION.

After having discussed the nature and origin of the variations, and after having considered the character of the Greek translation, it is necessary now to indicate the practical results of the investigation. These are not only of the greatest interest, but also of the highest value. In addition to their grammatical and lexical significance, they will be found important, some for the history, some for the interpretation, some for the correction, and some for the reconstruction of the present Massoretic text. Before indicating them, it will be proper to point out a further inconsistency which characterizes the arguments of a conservative critic, such as Graf, in dealing with the Alexandrian version.

In his extraordinary allegation, as was shown in the early part of this discussion, Graf attributes to the Septuagint nothing but caprice and imperfection. The foregoing investigation proves the charges that he brings against the translator to be unjust, and the arguments that he adduces in support of them to be untrue. His opinion of the

version is biassed and one-sided, and his treatment of the divergences is based upon a false hypothesis. It is no wonder, therefore, that some of his conclusions should be strangely inconsistent. Proceeding on a wrong assumption, he utterly misrepresents the character of the translation, and practically contradicts himself in discussing its nature and importance.

Graf first asserts, for instance, that the work (he refuses to call it a translation) possesses no critical authority whatever, and afterwards admits that his sweeping assertion is not strictly true. "When we, therefore, deny to the Alexandrian version any critical value," he says, "it must not by this be understood that in it the traces of a better reading than that of the Massoretic text may not here and there have been retained."[1] In making this admission he partially corrects himself, as well as wholly negatives his former statement. If the Greek preserves some readings that are better than the corresponding readings in the Hebrew, it must be taken into account in every case of textual comparison; and, if any superiority should be conceded to the Septuagint, it must, at least, possess some critical authority. That it is an authority

1 "Wenn wir sonach der alexandrinischen Uebersetzung jeden kritischên Werth absprechen, so soll damit nicht gesagt sein, dass sich nicht darin hie und da die Spuren einer bessern Lesart als der masorethischen erhalten haben können." Einleitung, p. lvii.

of the first rank can be proved by rational and convincing evidence. Had Graf devoted more attention to ascertaining the true nature of the variations, he must inevitably have modified, as well his later as his earlier judgment.

Firstly, the results are important for the history of the Old Testament text. This investigation proves conclusively that the Septuagint was translated from a special manuscript. This manuscript, though differing widely from the original of the existing Hebrew manuscripts, was not, as has been shown, entirely different. In certain parts, the manuscripts were identical; in other parts, they were substantially alike; in other parts again, they were exceedingly unlike, though not so much unlike, for the reasons already indicated, as would at first appear. The narrative and historic portions, as a rule, are very similar; yet even here the differences, though often slight, are manifestly textual. The poetic and prophetic portions, though, are so divergent that, after the fullest allowance has been made for glosses and for imperfections, nothing but the hypothesis of a special manuscript can explain the differences. After all the other probable causes of variation are pointed out, there still remains the fundamental cause of different text-recensions.

Owing to the absence of definite information on

the subject, it is difficult to treat the history of the text of the Old Testament thoroughly or scientifically. For the present purpose, however, it may be roughly but conveniently divided into three general periods. For the history of the Hebrew text alone four periods might appropriately be made, but for the history of the Greek and Hebrew texts combined three only appear to be sufficient. The interval between the official composition and the official collection of the books of ancient Scripture may constitute the first period; the interval between the formation of the canon and the translation of the Septuagint may constitute the second period; the interval between the time of the translation and the present time may constitute the third period. The practical advantage of this division, it is thought, will be promptly admitted and appreciated.

Of the first period, extending to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, very little now is known with certainty. The nature and condition of the ancient text are wrapt in much obscurity. So far as has been ascertained, various durable materials appear to have been used for manuscripts, and archaic Hebrew characters, akin to the old Phœnician alphabet, appear to have been employed in writing. In the well-known Siloam inscription the words are separated by dots; but this custom was rather

exceptional, perhaps, than universal. Commonly, it is supposed, the characters were written close together, without any marks of division between the words, and without any vowel signs to indicate their true pronunciation or interpretation. Hence errors in translating, as well as in transcribing, Hebrew manuscripts would easily arise, partly because of the irregularity of the characters, and partly because of the practice of writing them. From one or other of these causes, too, divergences would naturally creep into the Scripture text.

Of the second period, extending to the time of the Septuagint translation, somewhat more is known. During this period the different recensions, or families of manuscripts, may possibly have arisen. But, perhaps, the most important information furnished respecting the history of the text throughout this period concerns the Hebrew alphabet. Apparently, there was a gradual change from the archaic to the cursive, and from the cursive to the Aramaic or rectangular form of writing. This investigation, it is believed, will throw some light upon the kind of characters from which the Greek translation of this book was made. The frequent and unexpected substitution of letters, quite similar in the earlier, but quite dissimilar in the later, alphabets, seems to indicate that the Alexandrian recension was written in the Aramaic-

Egyptian or Palmyrian characters. In many places, where the ancient manuscripts were evidently alike, the variations may be most reasonably explained by reference to the one or the other of these irregular alphabets. This investigation also shows that the translation of this book was made from a totally unpointed text; that is, a text in which there were neither signs of separation nor points of punctuation. The nature of the divergences proves conclusively that this must have been the case. Owing to the similarity of letters, to the absence of word-signs, and to the non-existence of vowel-points, more or less confusion was inevitable. Had the characters been distinct, or the words divided, or the vowels indicated, such deviations as frequently appear could not possibly have occurred.

Of the third period, extending to the present time, the information respecting the Old Testament text is tolerably full and definite. We are now concerned, however, only with such data as belong alike to both the Hebrew and the Greek. Since the time of the translation, each text has had its own distinctive history. While the manuscripts of each have suffered somewhat by transmission, the text of the Greek may have remained substantially the same. With the Hebrew, on the other hand, the reverse of this has been the case. Whether or not the process of Scripture interpolation began

before the time of the Septuagint, it seems afterwards, as has been shown, to have been practised extensively in the Hebrew manuscripts until the days of the Massorites. The relation of the two texts practically establishes beyond a doubt that, during this period, the Palestinean recension suffered considerably by revision and interpolation, liberties having been taken, not only with the language, but also with the subject-matter, of the text. The extraordinary care of the Jews for the protection of their Scriptures from corruption can be traced back only for a certain distance in the past. It merely extends to the time when the Massoretic system was invented or completed, in the early centuries of the Christian era. While this system, therefore, guarantees the purity of the Hebrew since the time that it was adopted, it affords no guarantee whatever for its uncorrupted preservation at a period previous to that date. "The popular notion as to the absolutely sacred guardianship of the Hebrew text by the Jews is only partially founded on fact. It is true as regards the post-Massoretic, not the pre-Massoretic, text."[1] The truth of this observation is undeniable. It is also significant as showing that the process of fixing the Hebrew text was gradual, and may have extended over many centuries. In all probability,

[1] *Edinburgh Review*, October, 1885, p. 457.

it was fixed at first for public and official purposes. Afterwards, fixedness would be required both for safety and for uniformity.

The preceding paragraph assumes with students of the Septuagint generally that, apart from occasional imperfections and corruptions arising from transmission, the Greek text actually reproduces the Hebrew original employed by the Alexandrian translator. Cornill, for instance, in the exhaustive Prolegomena to his new and scholarly discussion of Ezekiel, asserts emphatically that, "in the Septuagint, we have reason to welcome a perfectly trustworthy witness to the Hebrew text of Ezekiel, as used at Alexandria in the third century before Christ."[1] This position may appear, perhaps, extreme, if not untenable. It may be held by some that the version, as it now exists, simply represents the form in which it circulated amongst the Jews previous to the days of Origen, or the shape it had assumed in the centuries intervening between the time of the translation and the date of the earliest Greek manuscripts. This question must, of course, be settled before the absolute critical value of the version can be definitely determined. It will, undoubtedly, be admitted by all scholars that, in the Septuagint, we have an authoritative version of a Hebrew

[1] *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, p. 102.

manuscript belonging to the third century before Christ, only when there are good grounds for believing that the oldest and best Greek manuscript that we possess substantially preserves the original translation.

Secondly, the results are important for the interpretation of the Old Testament text. A number of examples might be given where the Greek either helps to explain a difficult passage, or serves to show how a doubtful or disputed expression should be understood. For instance, in the Revised Version, the word רַדְנוּ, in the latter half of chap. ii. 31, is rendered "We are broken loose;" whereas, in the Authorized Version, it is rendered "We are lords." The Septuagint translation proves that the latter rendering is correct. The figure is not that of an animal having broken loose, but of a person having become master, or of one having obtained power to carry out one's own will. In the last part of ver. 34 also, the former version puts in the text, "I have not found it at the place of breaking in," and in the margin, "thou didst not find them," etc.; while the latter version translates, "I have not found it by secret search." The Septuagint indicates that the sentence should be rendered, "I did not find them breaking in (at house-breaking)." The words translated "breaking in" mean literally digging through or

under, for the purpose of entering or undermining a house; and the same forms occur in Exod. xxii. 2, in both the Hebrew and the Greek.

Again, in the Revised Version, the first half of chap. v. 12 is rendered, "They have denied the Lord, and said, It is not he;" and, in the Authorized Version, it is rendered, "They have belied the Lord, and said," etc. The words in the original translated "It is not he" are commonly interpreted, It is not God who speaks, as if the prophet were proclaiming his own inventions; or, God is not, as if the people were speaking after the analogy of the impious man described in Ps. xiv. 1. But the Hebrew words לוא־הוא are translated in the Septuagint by the phrase *Οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα*, which in classic Greek often has the meaning, "it is not so," or, "these things are not true." Demosthenes repeatedly uses the expression in this sense. The parallelism of the verse-members, as well as the nature of the context, proves that the Alexandrian rendering is right. The people rejected the prophet's message of warning, and refused to believe that his prophecy was true. Hence the Hebrew should be translated, "They have denied the Lord, and said, *that is not so.*" In this way, the Septuagint shows how the verse was understood at the time of the translation, and also how it should be understood to-day. Hitherto, in modern times,

this passage has been mistranslated, and its meaning has been misconceived.

For the interpretation or explanation of certain expressions peculiar to this book, the Septuagint is particularly important. One unusual expression refers to Messianic prophecy. In the Hebrew, there are two passages whose prophetic character has always possessed a special interest, namely, chaps. xxiii. 6; xxxiii. 16. In the Greek, the latter verse, together with the whole latter half of the chapter, is entirely wanting; while the former verse, with the exception of one word, is literally reproduced. Instead of צִדְקֵנוּ ("our righteousness"), the Greek has יְהוֹצָדָק ("Jah or Jehovah is righteous"), the term being a proper name, which occurs in both texts, Hag. i. 1; Ezra iii. 2, and elsewhere. As the corresponding words in Hebrew may also be regarded as a proper name, and as the order of the words in each text is identical, the Septuagint shows, not only how the verse was once interpreted, but also how it should be now translated. In the Authorized Version, the second member of the verse is rendered, "and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS;" in the Revised Version, on the other hand, the latter words are rendered, "The Lord is our righteousness." In the one version, the Messianic testimony is emphasized by typo-

graphical expedients; in the other version, the passage properly appears in ordinary type. In neither version, though, is the rendering quite correct. The word translated "shall be called" is not a passive but an active verb, which is followed by a pronominal suffix in the objective case. In the translation, this pronoun is improperly omitted. The Hebrew, therefore, may be literally translated, "and this is his name which *one* shall call *him*, The Lord is our righteousness;" or, regarding the latter words in the original as a proper name, after the analogy of "Jehovah-Jireh," Gen. xxii. 14; "Jehovah-Nissi," Exod. xvii. 15; "Jehovah-Shammah," Ezek. xlviii. 35, it may be better translated, "and this is his name which *one* shall call *him*, Jehovah-Tsidkenu."

The Septuagint shows that this latter rendering is preferable. It shows more. It also indicates the proper subject of the verb "shall call." In the Alexandrian version, the passage reads, "and this is his name which *Jehovah* shall call *him*, Jehozadak." The order of the words in both texts is exactly alike, the only difference in the readings being צִדְקֵנוּ ("Tsidkenu"), in the one text, for יְהוֹצָדָק ("Jehozadak"), in the other text. As "Jehovah" is the subject of the verb in Greek, so also it may be in Hebrew. Indeed, the construction of the Hebrew implies as much. Gram-

matically, "Jehovah" may be taken as the subject of the verb, instead of being taken as in apposition with its object; and the passage may be naturally and properly translated, "and this is his name which *Jehovah* shall call *him*, Tsidkenu." But for the Messianic reference, it would probably have been so translated by scholars from the first. Even the Massoretic accentuation seems to show clearly that "Jehovah" belongs to the word preceding and not to the word succeeding it, and, therefore, should be construed, as just indicated.

As the word for Jehovah occurs twice in this passage in Greek, once as the subject of the verb and once as a portion of the proper name, it is evident that the verse was understood, as thus explained, at the time of the translation. It is also evident that at that time there was no thought in the minds of the readers of the Alexandrian recension of characterizing the person mentioned in this passage as other than a human being. Interpreters of prophecy have commonly endeavoured to find here a belief, on the part of the ancient Jews, in the divinity of the promised Messiah; or, at least, an expectation, on the part of the Hebrew prophet, that the coming king whom he foretold should be a divine individual. The Septuagint translation of this book plainly indicates that no such notion was entertained by the translator, and

that he never for a moment supposed that the future ruler he both promised and described was to be a Divine Being.

Moreover, the omission from the Septuagint of the parallel passage, chap. xxxiii. 16, where the term "Jehovah-Tsidkenu" appears in the Hebrew as the name of the restored Jerusalem, is also very significant. The absence of the passage there, as well as the form of the passage here, in the Greek, is exceedingly important for the subject of Messianic prophecy, the character of which differs in different prophetic books. In Jeremiah, as compared with Isa. ix. 2–7, for instance, where the idea first appears, it is supposed by W. Robertson Smith,[1] there is a perceptibly diminished emphasis on the advent of a personal Messiah. The expectation of a national deliverer, who should introduce a reign of peace, is simply but emphatically expressed. This deliverer, however, is spoken of as a temporal prince. Nothing in the book, when studied in connection with the Septuagint, or when interpreted by the help of that translation, points to an eternal "Prince of Peace." Thus the Alexandrian version sheds some light upon the gradual growth and modification of the Messianic idea in the Church, and upon the historic development of the Messianic doctrine in the Scripture. The idea of the expected

[1] *The Prophets of Israel*, p. 277.

Messiah grew and changed in each successive century; and in no other age, it is believed, was its expression so minute and circumstantial, as in the period extending from the close of the Old to the opening of the New Testament.

Another unusual expression, peculiar to the Massoretic text, has reference to the term, "the servant of Jehovah," which is frequently found and variously applied in Scripture. Properly speaking, a servant of Jehovah was one who voluntarily gave himself to the service of God, and earnestly endeavoured to do his divine will. Spontaneity and fidelity are two essential elements in the idea of the term. With this signification, "the servant of Jehovah" was a distinguished title of honour under the old covenant. In this sense, it is applied to Moses, in Deut. xxxiv. 5; to Joshua, in Judg. ii. 8; to David, in Ps. xviii. 1. In the Hebrew, chaps. xxv. 9; xxvii. 6; xliii. 10, the words "my servant" are applied to Nebuchadnezzar. In each of these three chapters, though, the expression is significantly wanting in the Septuagint. This fact renders the character of the words in Hebrew suspicious, and their application questionable. Elsewhere throughout the whole Old Testament, they are applied only to a person or to a people of righteous purpose. In this sense, they are used of Abraham, in Gen. xxvi. 24; of Israel, as Jehovah's

people, in Isa. xli. 8; of Jacob, as a synonym for Israel, in Isa. xliv. 1, 2; xlv. 4; also in this book, chaps. xxx. 10; xlvi. 27 of the Hebrew, and in the latter chapter only of the Greek.

From these considerations, the words "my servant," in the Hebrew, can scarcely have originated from Jeremiah. He would hardly have applied them to a person like Nebuchadnezzar. The king of Babylon was not a servant of Jehovah in the ordinary acceptation of the term, nor can it be appropriately used of him. After the Babylonian captivity, however, some one, who regarded him as a predetermined instrument of Jehovah for executing the divine purposes respecting his covenant people, may have inserted the words where they appear in the Massoretic text. This suggestion seems the more probable, inasmuch as in Ezek. xxix. 20, Nebuchadnezzar is said to have received Egypt as the wages for himself and his army in serving against Tyre, "because they wrought for me, saith the Lord God." It is also worthy of note in this connection, that the distinguished Jewish commentator, Rashi, in his annotations on chap. xxv. 9, says nothing whatever about the phrase "my servant," as though he did not find it in his text; whereas, in chap. xxvii. 6, he explains the words to mean that Nebuchadnezzar was a servant of Jehovah only in the sense of being a scourge.

His comment on the expression reads, "he should do my pleasure to recompense my enemies."[1]

There is still another unusual species of expression, peculiar to the Hebrew text of Jeremiah, on the nature of which the Septuagint also gives some information. In the Hebrew, chaps. xxv. 26; li. 41, the term "Sheshach" occurs as a synonym, it is supposed, either for Babylon or for Babylonia, according to a secret or cabalistic system of writing, technically called Atbash, which was practised amongst the ancient Jews, and which consisted in substituting the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet for the first, the last but one for the second, and so on through the whole series. On this principle of transposition, as the consonants only were formerly written in Hebrew, the letters Sh Sh Ch which compose the word *Sheshach* would correspond to the letters B B L of which the word *Babel* (Babylon) is composed. This term is wanting altogether in the Septuagint, being found there in neither passage; but its mystic meaning seems to be confirmed by the latter passage, chap. li. 41, where Sheshach and Babylon occur in the parallel members of the Hebrew verse. In chap. li. 1, however, where another instance of this kind of cabalistic writing occurs, the Septuagint shows how the mystical name should be translated. The expres-

[1] שיעשה רצוני ליפרע משנאי.

sion "Leb-kamai," which stands in the text of the Revised Version, and is rendered in the margin, "The heart of them that rise up against me," becomes, when transmuted according to the figure of Atbash, Ca S D I M, which is equivalent to Chaldea or the Chaldeans. As this is the actual rendering of the Greek in this verse, the singular term is proved to be a Jewish cipher, and its significance is made very plain. Properly, therefore, the word Chaldea or Chaldeans should take the place of "Leb-kamai" in the text.

Although a love for fancifully playing upon words, and a liking for artificially dealing with letters, were always characteristic of the Hebrew writers, it has been doubted whether this peculiar practice of writing words by substituting consonants according to their position in the alphabet is as old as Jeremiah. Let that be as it may, the system dates from an unknown antiquity, and may be older than the prophet's time. The important question is, Did Jeremiah himself invent or authorize such ciphers? Most probably he did not. They seem to have belonged only to the Palestinean recension, having possibly been adopted by the Jews during the period of the Babylonian captivity. During the exile, there may have been a purpose in their adopting such mystical names to designate Babylonia or Chaldea, because of their

captive condition in that country. For the Jews of Jeremiah's day, however, both in Palestine and in Egypt, there was no need whatever either to adopt or to employ such terms. For this reason, as well as for the reason that the word "Sheshach," chap. li. 41, and the sentence, "and the king of Sheshach shall drink after them," chap. xxv. 26, are wanting in the Septuagint, they seem not to have belonged to the Alexandrian recension.

Thirdly, the results are important for the correction of the Old Testament text. The number of places where the Greek corrects the Hebrew is somewhat large. It is not necessary, however, to furnish a complete list of such passages. A few of the more interesting or more important will suffice. In chap. i. 17, for instance, God is represented in the Hebrew as sending the prophet on his mission of remonstrance to the people, with the menacing words, "be not dismayed at them, lest I dismay thee before them." The reading is apparently incorrect, and may have arisen from some imperfection in the ancient manuscript. Such a menace seems entirely out of place, as well as altogether out of harmony with the character of God. The context here leads one to expect words of encouragement not threatening, of comfort not intimidation. On account of his youth, the prophet would naturally be timid in undertaking the duties of the

prophetic office, under the peculiar circumstances of his time, and surely a degree of fear that was inevitable would not cause him to forfeit his rightful claim to God's protecting care. The Septuagint renders the latter half of this verse, "Fear not before them, and be not dismayed at them; because I am with thee to deliver thee, declares Jehovah." The reading, which here corrects the Hebrew, is a classic one, occurring several times in this book, as well as many times in the other books of the Old Testament. The addition also improves the parallelism of the verse, closely corresponds with the idea in vers. 8, 19, and admirably harmonizes with the context.

Again, the latter part of chap. ii. 34 in the Hebrew reads, "upon all these." In the margin of the Revised Version, though, it is stated that some ancient authorities have "every oak." This is the rendering of the Septuagint, with which, moreover, the Syriac closely corresponds. The words, as they are found in Hebrew, are exceedingly obscure and difficult to explain. The variant reading in the version was due merely to a slight difference of punctuation, the consonants having been exactly alike; but the pointing of the Septuagint appears to be correct. There is a contrast here expressed between slaying a person who was caught in the act of breaking into a house, which was permitted

by the ancient Mosaic law, and slaying a person who was caught, not in committing but in exposing and denouncing crime, which was both cruel and detestable. According to this passage, the victims whom Israel slew were not criminals but innocents, not persons guilty of house-breaking, but persons guilty only of reproving her for her idolatry. She had shed innocent blood under the trees, or in the groves, where she had practised her idolatrous worship, and where for which her victims had reproved her. Thus the construction in the Greek is clear, and shows how the Hebrew should be read. The whole latter half of this verse may be rightly rendered, "I did not find them breaking in (at house-breaking), but upon every oak."

In chap. vi. 6, for the word "trees," which stands in the text, the Revised Version has in the margin "her trees." This is the rendering, not only of the Greek, but also of the Latin and the Syriac versions. The difference of reading, again, was due to the insertion of a single dot or point. The last letter of the word translated "trees" should contain a small dot (Mappik), as in Deut. xx. 19, and should be construed as a suffix of the third person singular. Although, in besieging a city, the Jews were commanded to spare, so far as possible, the fruit-trees, partly because of their innocence and partly because of their usefulness,

yet they were permitted to use the wood of other trees for the purpose of carrying on a siege. The foreign army mentioned in this passage would probably cut down trees, both for building their bulwarks against the city and for clearing away all obstacles to their approach. Another example of a similar kind, where the variation was due to the insertion of the same point, occurs also in chap. xii. 9. Instead of the reading, "to devour," the Greek has "to devour her." This latter seems to be the better reading of the two, and to represent the proper punctuation.

In chap. xii. 2, the word translated "they grow" means literally in Hebrew they go or proceed. In the Septuagint, the word used means they bear or produce; and, apparently, may be just as properly applied to trees as to men. The latter reading is required by the parallelism of the verse, this clause of which, according to the Greek, being translated, "they produce, yea, they bring forth fruit." The variation arose from the substitution of a single letter, the Massorites having read ילך, and the Greek translator ילד. As the former verb in Hebrew does not mean "to grow," and is nowhere else used in this sense, it is evidently incorrect. Even Hitzig gives no reason why the latter verb may not be used, as indicated. In chaps. xi. 23; xxiii. 12, for "even the year of their visitation," one

should read "in the year," etc., as suggested in the margin of the Revised Version. In each verse, this is the rendering of the Greek, and the Hebrew should be rendered accordingly. The reference is to a period of calamity during which the judgment here foretold should be fulfilled.

Another place in which the Greek corrects the Hebrew occurs in chap. xv. 14, where the latter is rendered in the text of the Revised Version, "I will make them to pass with thine enemies," etc., and in the margin, "I will make thine enemies to pass," etc. According to some ancient authorities, the Revisers further state, the clause is rendered, "I will make (cause) thee to serve thine enemies," etc. These authorities are specially the Alexandrian, Syriac, and Aramaic versions. Other manuscripts also exhibit the same reading, which is unquestionably the correct one, as even Graf, along with many other critics, honestly admits. This rendering, moreover, agrees exactly with the parallel passage in chap. xvii. 4, where the same form is found in Hebrew, that is found here in Greek. The variation between the two verbs in this sentence arose from the simple substitution of a ר for a ד in the ancient texts.

In chap. xxiii. 17, instead of the rendering, "that despise me, the Lord hath said," the Revisers place in the margin, "that despise the word of the

Lord." This is the reading, not only of the Greek, but also of the Syriac, version. The variation was due again to punctuation, which in the versions is evidently right. An utterance of Jehovah in the broken form in which it here appears in Hebrew nowhere else occurs, as Graf has pointed out. In ver. 33 of this same chapter, instead of the exclamatory question, "What burden!" the Septuagint and Vulgate have, as the Revisers indicate, "Ye are the burden." This latter reading, which arose simply from a different division of the words in the Hebrew, gives a vastly better meaning, and undoubtedly expresses what the prophet meant to say. The case affords a beautiful example of a superior word-division on the part of the Greek translator. In ver. 39 also, instead of "I will utterly forget you" the Latin, Greek, and Syriac versions have, "I will lift you up." This reading is required by the parallelism of the verse, which, as it stands in Hebrew, makes no appropriate sense. The figure is one of lifting up a burden, and of casting it away. Punctuation here again explains the variation.

Fourthly, the results are important for the reconstruction of the Old Testament text. The instances of correction just discussed furnish interesting illustrations. In every case, apparently, the Greek reading should take the place of the Hebrew

reading. In every case, too, notwithstanding the great difficulty of translating an unpointed and unpunctuated text, the superiority of the Septuagint was due to the translator having either divided or punctuated the consonants more correctly than did the Massorites. Such examples not only bear witness to the fidelity with which, under the most disadvantageous circumstances, the Alexandrian version was made, but also to its importance for purposes of text-criticism. Some other examples of superior readings, whose value for reconstructing the present Massoretic text will be readily acknowledged by scholars, it is believed, may now be given. These may be arranged in several classes, as the passages are numerous.

The first class comprises whole verses. In certain places, the Hebrew is so imperfect that it is practically impossible to render it intelligibly. Chap. xi. 15, for instance, is so obscure that, as it stands, no clear or consistent meaning can be obtained from it. The ancient manuscript was evidently corrupt or indistinct. On the other hand, the reading in the Greek is good, and makes excellent and appropriate sense. The people, having by their idolatry forsaken Jehovah, and having by their hypocrisy forfeited all claims upon him or his house, are here rebuked for their deceitful service by the prophet, who asks if they suppose that

prayers and sacrifices can rescue them or atone for them. The entire verse is rendered in the Septuagint, "Why has the beloved wrought abomination in my house? Shall vows and holy flesh remove from thee thy wickednesses, or by these shalt thou escape?"

Another verse of doubtful rendering in the Hebrew occurs in chap. xvii. 11. In the Authorized Version, the partridge is represented as sitting on eggs and hatching them not. Both verbs are here translated incorrectly. The Revised Version gives a more adequate rendering of them, as well as of the remaining portions of the verse; but, by its marginal readings, it leaves the reader still in doubt about the true translation of the verse, which, in the Greek is very plain, and may be rendered, "As the partridge *calleth* (and) gathereth *what* she hath not brought forth, so is he that getteth *his* riches not by right; in the midst of his days they shall leave him, and in his end (latter time) he shall be a fool." The Greek shows that the subject of the verb "shall leave" is the noun "riches," and not the pronoun "he." The idea is not that the rich man should suddenly die and leave his wealth, but that his wealth should speedily leave him, ere he had lived out half his days; so that, during the rest of his life, he should be regarded as an example of wicked folly. The point of the prophet's illus-

tration thus appears to be that, as the partridge was popularly supposed to call together the young of other birds which would forsake her when they heard the cry of their true parent, so ill-gotten gains would prove but a short-lived possession to the dishonest man. The Septuagint also shows that originally the two texts in this verse, though very similar, were not identical. As they now appear respectively, one variation between them was due to a different division of the Hebrew consonants; the other variations between them were due to different readings in the ancient manuscripts.

Still another imperfect verse in Hebrew occurs in chap. xxxi. 25, the construction of the words of which is very simple, but the form of one of which, at least, is very questionable. The verse in Greek, on the contrary, is admirably rendered, and reproduces a superior text. It reads, "For I have satiated *every* thirsty soul, and every hungry soul have I replenished." This rendering is much more symmetrical than that in our English Bibles, and presents a perfect contrast between the thirsty and the hungry souls of whom the prophet speaks. That the original of each text was slightly different, is demonstrated by the presence of the additional pronoun "every," as well as suggested by the form of the words in Hebrew, respectively translated

"weary" and "sorrowful." Literally, the former word means weak or faint, the latter languishing or pining. If the words in each original were alike, the one must have meant faint with thirst, the other pining with hunger; so that both should be translated as they are in the Septuagint, the rendering of which is corroborated by the connection of thought in this with that in the preceding verse. While it is barely possible that the former word was written differently in each ancient manuscript, it is very probable that the latter was. Instead of דָאֲבָה, the translator apparently read, with Schleusner, רְעֵבָה. In ver. 12 of this chapter also, where the same root occurs, and where a similar idea is expressed in the Greek, the rendering of the Alexandrian version is superior to that of the English translation. The Septuagint renders the last member of this verse, "and their soul shall be as a *fruitful tree*, and they shall not *hunger* any more."

The second class comprises verse-members. A number of examples might be given, but a few will be sufficient. For the sake of conciseness, the words in Greek, which show how the Hebrew may be reconstructed, will be indicated by italics. In the second member of chap. ii. 19, the reading of the Septuagint, "and *I have* not *been pleased with* thee," gives a superior rendering of this portion of

the verse, and seems to show that the construction in the Hebrew is not simply peculiar but imperfect. In the first member of ver. 34 of this same chapter, too, the Septuagint reading, "Also in thy *hands* is found the *blood* (plu.) of the souls of the innocents," is preferable in each case. The word "hands" instead of "skirts" is much more appropriate in this place, and was evidently the original reading in the early manuscripts. The variation possibly arose from the Massorites having mistaken the meaning of the Hebrew word for wing or skirt, which may have been written anciently without the letter נ, and may have had the same form as the word for hand. It is significant that the Syriac version also agrees here with the Alexandrian version.

In the middle of chap. xi. 19, the Greek rendering, "*come* and let us *put* wood into his food (bread)," which is supported by the Aramaic version, shows how the passage may be intelligibly translated. As the sentence stands in English, it does not accurately represent the original Hebrew. The word translated "fruit" means literally bread or food. It is nowhere in the Old Testament used of vegetable fruit, and to give it such a peculiar meaning here is to violate the usage of the language. Neither can the word be properly applied to Jeremiah. His fruit could not reasonably mean

either his activity, or his posterity, or his words of prophecy, all of which have been suggested by way of exposition. Neither can the whole expression be appropriately applied to the prophet with the force of a proverb, because of the reasons just indicated. The Septuagint shows how the sentence should be rationally translated, as well as how it was unquestionably understood at the time of the translation. It is significant that Jerome seems to cite the rendering of the Septuagint with approval. It is still more significant that the Aramaic translator also uses a verb meaning to put or to place, and, instead of the word "wood," renders "deadly poison." The idea intended to be expressed was that of destroying the prophet by poisoning him; that is, by putting pulverized poisonous wood into his food. The superior rendering of the version was recensional, and was due to the presence of the verb "come," and to the absence of the letter ה, in the original Hebrew manuscript. This latter variation, it should be observed, may have arisen from dictation.

In the second member of chap. xiii. 18, the Greek reading, "for the crown of your glory (your glorious crown) has been taken down *from your head*," again shows how the sentence should be rendered. The Hebrew word, translated "principalities," in the Authorized Version, and "head-

tires," in the Revised Version, is not a noun in apposition with crown, as indicated by the Massoretic punctuation, but a noun and preposition, as shown by the Septuagint translation. The singular verb in Hebrew, as well as the general construction of the sentence, shows that the rendering of the Alexandrian version is correct. On account of their changed circumstances, the youthful monarch and his royal mother were to sit in humiliation, not because their head-dresses were come down, but because their regal glory was gone.

Again, the first part of chap. xv. 16 is rendered in the Septuagint, "*from those despising* thy words; *destroy* them." This reading, which arose from a slightly different combination of letters in the original, seems to suit the context better than the reading in the Hebrew, which is certainly peculiar, and, in the present connection, apparently inappropriate. The feeble figure of eating words is scarcely analogous to the bold figure of eating a parchment roll in Ezek. iii. 1–3. In ver. 15 of each text, the prophet asks Jehovah to avenge him of his persecutors; in ver. 16 of the Greek, he prays for their destruction. Thus the parallelism in the Greek is more complete than in the Hebrew. The superiority of the Septuagint in this passage will appear more clearly by translating, together with the variant reading, the immediately preceding and

the immediately succeeding sentence. The passage reads, "Know that for thy sake I have suffered reproach from those despising thy words; destroy them, and let thy word be unto me for the joy and rejoicing of my heart."

Once more, the first part of chap. xvi. 7 is rendered in the Septuagint, "neither shall *bread* be broken at (in) *their* mourning," etc. This reading shows how the Hebrew should be reconstructed. The variation was due to the simple substitution or alteration of a single letter, and is supported by other ancient manuscripts. In the Revised Version, the words "for them" should be translated "bread," and the word "*bread*," which is printed in italics, should be expunged. The verb "break" here in the Hebrew does not of itself necessarily mean to break bread. It only has this signification when the word for bread, as in Isa. lviii. 7, is expressed as its object. Moreover, the words "for them" are further shown to have arisen erroneously from the word "bread," because, as Graf admits, they do not harmonize with the singular Hebrew suffix after the verb "to comfort," which is improperly translated as a plural pronoun in the English Bible.

Further, the second member of chap. xviii. 14 should be reconstructed by the help of the Septuagint. While the general sense of the Hebrew

words is clear, the combination of adjectives is peculiar, and difficult to understand. The Revised Version does not give an adequate translation of them either in the margin or in the text. The reading in the Greek, which arose from a text similar to that of the Hebrew, but more complete than the latter is, gives an excellent rendering of the sentence. Before translating the Septuagint here, it should be observed that the form of the first member in Hebrew is somewhat unusual; and that its form in Greek, which represents a very similar text, is so interesting as to be worthy of careful consideration. A translation, therefore, of the whole Greek verse, because of its possible correctness, if not probable superiority, may advantageously be given. It reads, "Shall *protuberances* depart from rocks, or the snow from Lebanon? or, shall waters *borne violently by the wind* turn aside?"

Lastly, in the middle of chap. xli. 9, the Septuagint reading, "*the same is the great pit,*" appears undoubtedly to be the true one. In the Authorized Version, the rendering, "because of Gedaliah," is absolutely false, as Graf affirms; and, in the Revised Version, the rendering, "by the side of Gedaliah," is essentially wrong, as he also asserts. The words in the original do not properly admit of either rendering, and cannot, as they stand, be grammati-

cally construed. The Hebrew reading here is utterly indefensible, and was evidently due to textual imperfection, or to erroneous transcription, or, perhaps, to both. The originals of the present Greek and Hebrew texts are very similar; and the one, as scholars know, was easily derivable from the other by a slight confusion of the letters. The excellence of the construction in the Greek is worth indicating by a translation of the context. The whole verse reads, "Now the pit wherein Ishmael cast all those whom he had slain (*the same is the great pit* which Asa the king had made for fear of Baasha, king of Israel), this Ishmael filled with them that were slain."

The third class comprises single words. A very large number of places might be pointed out where a suffix, or a verbal form, or a particle of some kind represents a manifestly superior reading in the Septuagint. As many such instances have been already noticed by Movers and Hitzig, as well as by Graf himself, and as many others will be at once observed by those who take the trouble critically to compare the Hebrew with the Greek throughout, brevity forbids the multiplying of examples. For reasons that will plainly appear to scholars, a small number of such places in the Hebrew, which should be reconstructed by the Greek, may here be briefly indicated. These are,

"shall blaze forth" for "shall break forth," chap. i. 14; "wall" for "walls," chap. i. 18; "destroyed" for "burned up," chap. ii. 15; "stained" for "marked," chap. ii. 22; "burned" for "broken down," chap. iv. 26; "a refiner" for "refining," chap. vi. 29; "shall be consumed" for "shall die," chaps. xi. 22; xlii. 17, 22; "drought" for "droughts," chap. xiv. 1; "tamarisk" for "heath," chap. xvii. 6; "deep" for "deceitful," chap. xvii. 9; "shall be inhabited" for "shall remain," chap. xvii. 25; "moulded" for "potter," chap. xix. 1; "Ahaz" for "cedar," chap. xxii. 15; "these" for "swearing," chap. xxiii. 10; "reproach" for "desolations," chap. xxv. 9; "multitude" for "mounts," chap. xxxii. 24; "earth" for "Jehovah," chap. xxxiii. 2; "your princes" for "his wives," chap. xliv. 9; "voice" for "shame," chap. xlvi. 12; "the name" for "there," chap. xlvi. 17; "upon her" for "it is come," chap. xlvi. 20; "wild ass" for "heath," chap. xlviii. 6; "altars" for "daughters," chap. xlix. 2; "in her forest" for "in his cities," chap. l. 32; "around" for "hollow," chap. lii. 21.

The fourth class comprises proper names. In chap. xxxviii. 1, where the name "Shephatiah" appears in Hebrew, the Septuagint has "Zephaniah." The former word, as Graf remarks, nowhere else occurs. For this reason, as the latter word occurs

in chaps. xxix. 25; xxxvii. 3, of both the Hebrew and the Greek, it may be correct. In chap. xlii. 1, instead of "Jezaniah the son of Hoshaiah," the Greek reads, "Azariah the son of Maaseiah." As the name Azariah occurs in chap. xliii. 2 of both texts, and as the name Maaseiah also occurs with it in this latter chapter, the reading of the Septuagint seems to be the proper one. In other places again, such as "Gihon" for "Shihor," chap. ii. 18; "Assyrians" for "Syrians," chap. xxxv. 11; "On" for "land of Egypt," chap. xliii. 13; "Gilead" for "Gad," chap. xlix. 1, the version preserves not only the more correct, but also the more primitive reading, as Hitzig acknowledges respecting the first three of these examples. In each case, the name in Greek gives a more definite designation of the place described.

In chap. xli. 5, "Salem" for "Shiloh" affords another preferable reading. The former is supposed to have been situated nearer to Shechem than the latter was; and, for this reason, Hitzig again admits that the narrative in Greek furnishes the more natural order of the neighbouring cities mentioned in this passage. From the account given in Gen. xxxiii. 18, where the word is rightly rendered as a proper name in the Authorized Version, Salem was evidently a city in the land of Canaan, and is probably identical with the present *Sâlim*, a little

village lying somewhat east of *Nâblus*, the modern name of the ancient Shechem.[1] The latter seems formerly to have been the designation of a town, as well as of a tract of country. The occurrence of Salem here in the Greek version of Jeremiah corroborates the testimony of the Septuagint reading in Gen. xxxiii. 18, according to which the word is in apposition with the expression, "city of Shechem," which immediately follows. The Hebrew word שָׁלֵם seems not to be an adjective, as commonly assumed by modern scholars, but a proper name, occurring elsewhere only in Gen. xiv. 18. Having the same form in each verse, it should be translated and spelled each time in the same way, and not in a different way, as in the English version.

The Septuagint seems, moreover, to present an older and a superior form of the personal name in chap. xlix. 27. Instead of "Ben-hadad," the Greek here has *υἱοῦ Ἄδερ*, as in 1 Kings xv. 18, 20; xx. 1; 2 Kings xiii. 3, 24; Amos i. 4. The latter for the former term occurs so frequently and so uniformly in the version that the recensional character of the reading is unquestionable. The regularity of the spelling indicates that the original of the Greek expression was either בֶּן־הֲדַר, or more probably, perhaps, בֶּן־אֲדַר. This latter name or title denotes "the son of Adar," which was apparently the

[1] Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii., p. 1222.

designation of an ancient Syrian divinity, akin if not equivalent to the old Assyrian deity, an appellation of which appears in the word Adrammelech, as found in 2 Kings xvii. 31; xix. 37. The method of spelling the word "Nebuchadnezzar," in the Septuagint, also indicates a more primitive pronunciation of the name, and one in all probability more like the Assyrian original, which, Schrader says, is written *Na-bi-uv-ku-du-ur-ri-u-ṣu-ur* in the cuneiform inscriptions, but was pronounced *Nabû-kudur-ri-uṣur* by the native Babylonians.[1] Throughout this book, the word in Greek is almost regularly written *Ναβουχοδονόσορ*, corresponding to נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר in Hebrew. It is significant and noteworthy that the Vulgate adopts the spelling of the Septuagint, and writes the word "Nabuchodonosor," which is an exact transliteration of the Greek.

There are also a few places where the Septuagint shows a proper name in the Hebrew to be either wrongly formed or wrongly punctuated. In chap. xxxix. 3, for instance, the name "Samgar-Nebo" is apparently incorrect. Such a form does not elsewhere occur in the Bible, and Schrader says that it has not yet been found in the cuneiform inscriptions.[2] According to all analogy, in the Scripture spelling of Assyrian proper nouns compounded with

[1] *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, Zweite Auflage, p. 361.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 416.

"Nebo," the latter term should begin the name, as in Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuzaradan, and Nebushazban. The fact that the corresponding word in Greek is *Σαμαγώθ*, and that the two succeeding words, each of which begins with "Nebo," are *Ναβουσάχαρ* and *Ναβουσαρείς*, seems to confirm this supposition. In chap. xlix. 1, 3, again, the Revised Version has in the text "Malcam," and in the margin "their king." The word in Hebrew is incorrectly pointed. As it stands, it should be translated as a common noun with suffix, and not as a proper noun. With its present punctuation, therefore, the rendering of the margin is alone correct. The context shows, however, that the word in each verse is a proper name, and should be punctuated according to the Septuagint "Milcom." This was the name of the god of Ammon, and it seems never to have been properly pointed otherwise.

A careful comparison of the proper names of this book, as they occur respectively in each text, possesses a still further significance. It proves conclusively that the mode of spelling and pronouncing them, observed by the translator, was very often not the same as that adopted by the Massorites. It also seems to indicate that the ancient pronunciation of proper names differed greatly from that expressed at present in our Hebrew Bibles. In translating into Greek, the

laws of euphony, doubtless, would sometimes forbid the precise reproduction of a peculiarly Semitic sound, especially in the case of consonants. In the case of vowels, little or no difficulty would be felt. Whenever an exact equivalent of a consonant, therefore, was wanting in his language, the translator would be obliged, of course, to employ the letter or the combination of letters, which most nearly represented the Hebrew original. This course, it will be seen, he has consistently pursued. After making the fullest allowance, though, for such euphonic or linguistic peculiarities, which occur with almost systematic regularity, there still remains a number of remarkable divergences that can be explained only on the supposition that many names were once spelled and pronounced differently from the way in which they are to-day. The information furnished by the Septuagint respecting the ancient mode of spelling and pronouncing Hebrew proper names, it will be found, is of the greatest possible importance.

As the principal deviations of the version are manifest to scholars, it is not necessary to give many illustrations here. A few examples of the divergent method of expressing vowel sounds should be given, though, to show that the vowel notation of the Massorites is not the same as was that of the Alexandrian translator. When the

latter, for instance, writes an ă for an ĭ, as *Γαλαάδ* for גִּלְעָד (Gilead); an ĕ for an ĭ, as *Ἐμμήρ* for אִמֵּר (Immer); an ŏ for an ă, as *Γοδολίας* for גְּדַלְיָהוּ (Gedaliah); an ō for an ū, as *Ἀζώρ* for עַזּוּר (Azzur), and *Πασχώρ* for פַּשְׁחוּר (Pashhur); an ĕ for an ă and an ē for an ū, as *Σελλήμ* for שַׁלֻּם (Shallum), it is unreasonable to suppose that the change of vowel in each case was due to arbitrariness on his part. Every time he could as easily have given the one sound as he gave the other. In corresponding cases, it will be found, he has reproduced such vowels with scrupulous fidelity, as an ī in *Δαυίδ* for דָּוִד (David), and ă in *Γαμαρίας* for גְּמַרְיָה (Gemariah), an ā in *Ῥαχάβ* for רֵכָב (Rechab), an ē in *Ῥαχήλ* for רָחֵל (Rachel), and an ū in *Σαμουήλ* for שְׁמוּאֵל (Samuel). When, in other books, moreover, the Septuagint writes an ă and an ō in *Σαμψών* for שִׁמְשׁוֹן (Samson), the rational conclusion is that the name was so pronounced at the time that the translation was made. It is not just to assume that the pronunciation, represented in the Septuagint, was simply that which prevailed amongst the Jews of Egypt, and, therefore, would naturally be less pure than that which prevailed amongst the Jews of Palestine, as some scholars have assumed. Nor is it fair to assert with some, for reasons that need not be

now discussed, that the Massoretic pronunciation of proper names is absolutely correct, or that it infallibly represents the sound of every name as it was originally pronounced. Both from its age and character, it is quite reasonable to suppose that the version generally reproduces the earlier pronunciation. It is here sufficient, further, to observe that there are good grounds for believing that changes were at some time arbitrarily made in the form of certain Hebrew proper names. "Many," as Nestle says, "seem to have first arisen after the origin of the Septuagint."[1]

The investigation also furnishes some new and important suggestions for the Hebrew grammar. In chap. ii. 20, the rendering of which in Greek is excellent, by a different division of the letters, the Septuagint translates the two words אַתְּ צָעָה, as though they were a verb of the Hithpael species, אֶתְצָעֶה. According to the Massoretic system, this latter form is not now properly permissible, the law of euphony requiring אֶצְטָעֶה. As the translator evidently had before him the same consonants that the Hebrew has, and as he surely must have been acquainted with all the grammatical forms of the Hebrew language, he could hardly have regarded the combination as he did, had the

[1] "Manche scheinen erst nach der Entstehung der LXX. entstanden zu sein." *Die Israelitischen Eigennamen*, etc., p. 125.

form not been legitimate. It is highly improbable that he should have made such a mistake. The case is especially interesting, because it suggests the possibility, either that the present law of euphony in such verbal forms was not then strictly observed, or that it was not fully established when his Hebrew manuscript was made. In ver. 33 of this same chapter, there occurs a group of words, לֹא־כֵן כִּי גַם (not only, but also), which is peculiar in Hebrew at the present time, but which at one time may possibly have existed in the language.

In chap. iv. 5, the verb מְלֹאוּ, which is translated "aloud" in the Revised Version, is rendered in the Septuagint by the adverb מְלֹא, as though the latter were formerly a synonym for מְאֹד. In chap. v. 12, the expression לוֹא־הוּא being rendered by *Οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα* (these things are not so), indicates that the word הוּא, which is now used, sometimes as a pronoun and sometimes as a verb, was then used also as an adverb. This word is supposed to have been originally a demonstrative; and, besides its frequent occurrence as a personal pronoun and as a copula, it occasionally occurs as a demonstrative adjective to indicate an object already mentioned as well known, somewhat after the manner of our remote demonstrative *that*. The present passage shows that it

was likewise once employed as a demonstrative adverb.

In chaps. iii. 21; vii. 29, the Septuagint has "lips" for "bare heights." In each passage, the rendering in Greek is tolerably appropriate; but, in the latter passage especially, it suits the context exceedingly well. It is unlikely that the translator had before him שְׂפָתַיִם, the ordinary Hebrew word for lips. He evidently found in his manuscript a combination of letters similar to that in the Massoretic text; and instead of שְׁפָיִם, undoubtedly read שָׂפָם. Hence this latter word seems clearly to be an ancient dual form for the mouth or the lips, as it is rendered in both the English and Alexandrian versions of Ezek. xxiv. 17, 22.

In chap. xi. 21, the two words וְלֹא are rendered by the Septuagint εἰ δὲ μή. The translation is interesting, inasmuch as it seems to indicate that the ancient punctuation may have been וָלֹא, a form that is equivalent to וְאִם־לֹא, which occurs in 1 Sam. ii. 16, and which is substantially translated there in Greek as the words under consideration are translated here. Another interesting combination in Greek is found in chap. xiii. 27, where, for the present Hebrew expression מָתַי עֹד, the Septuagint has עַד־מָתַי עֹד.

In a large number of passages, moreover, one

preposition in the Greek stands for another preposition in the Hebrew. Sometimes each species of this sort of substitution is favourable to the Septuagint. Indeed, the form in Greek often corrects the form in Hebrew, as in chap. iii. 20, for instance, where the preposition מ (from) is rendered in the Septuagint ב (to). The variation evidently arose from the similarity of these two letters in the ancient alphabet, but the Greek preserves the proper reading. In Hebrew lexicons, it is stated that the verb בָּגַד rarely occurs with the preposition מ (from), and the present passage is cited as an example. Besides being the only instance, this verb appears not to have been rightly used with מ (from). The verse, therefore, should be rendered, "Surely as a wife proves faithless to her husband, so ye have proved faithless to me, O house of Israel, declares Jehovah." This case furnishes but one example out of very many that might be given of the way in which the Septuagint corrects peculiar or exceptional uses of prepositions in the present Hebrew text.

The testimony of the Septuagint is especially significant respecting the use of "in" or "into" and "on" or "upon," both of which in Hebrew are very often incorrectly used. Example after example might be given where the Greek presents, not only the preferable, but also the proper, form of one or

other of these words. In the Hebrew, the prepositions אֶל and עַל, which are rightly rendered in the version by εἰς and ἐπί respectively, are constantly and inconsistently interchanged, as though they were substantially synonymous. Very often this is the case where the sense, as well as the grammar, requires a distinction to be made. In the Greek, on the other hand, a distinction in harmony with the most classic Hebrew usage almost uniformly occurs. The version frequently has an אֶל for an עַל and *vice versa*, where the one or the other wrongly stands in the Hebrew. The translator's use of these two prepositions is so admirable, and so agreeable to the genius of the Jewish language, that apparently, in his manuscript, the true distinction between them was more carefully observed than it is in the present Massoretic text. The difference between the texts in this respect, while probably in part recensional, may possibly have been in part transcriptional. The difference, too, is decidedly in favour of the Septuagint.

For other unusual grammatical expressions, particularly for the so-called ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, or words that occur but once throughout the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint will also be found to be of the greatest value. Many such terms, in this book especially, are of very doubtful significance, and of very questionable correctness. In chap. xiv. 9, for

example, the word translated "astonied" is both obscure and inappropriate. The corresponding word in the version, on the other hand, affords an excellent sense. The first member of this verse in Greek is rendered, "Why shouldst thou be as a man *asleep*, as a *man* that cannot save?" The parallelism here is perfect, and the meaning expressed is superior to that in the Hebrew. In the former case, the divergency was due to the substitution of a ד for a ר and of a ה for a ד; in the latter case, it was due to the absence of the letter ו.
Each of these kinds of variation occurs with frequency. In this way, the version shows not only how variations arose, but also how they may be proved and estimated. The Hebrew of Jeremiah, as is well known, is remarkable for its numerous textual peculiarities. It displays a great many words and forms which cannot have belonged to the language in its purer state, but which may be corrected or emended by the aid of the Septuagint translation.

In addition to the examples given in the preceding paragraphs of the important results obtained from this investigation for the grammar and the lexicon, it might be much more fully shown, did space permit, how the Septuagint helps to throw light upon Hebrew forms of rare or single occurrence, as well as serves to furnish valuable sug-

gestions and corrections for future grammars and lexicons. One more example may be given by way of further illustration. In the last German edition of Gesenius's Dictionary, it is stated that the verb "to send," שָׁלַח, which is naturally followed by the accusative of the person or the thing sent, is followed by the accusative of the person sent with the letter ל only in 2 Chron. xvii. 7. The Septuagint shows that the same construction also occurs in chap. xvi. 16 of this book. This verse is rendered in the English Bible, as though the noun following the verb "send" in each member was in the dative, because of the preposition לְ (for) that stands with it in each case; whereas, the preposition here appears to be as certainly the sign of the accusative, as it is in the passage mentioned in Chronicles, where the nouns following it are correctly construed in the English version as accusatives. According to the Greek rendering of each passage under consideration, therefore, the present verse should be translated, "Behold, I will send many fishers, declares Jehovah, and they shall fish them; and, afterward, I will send many hunters, and they shall hunt them from every mountain, and from every hill, and out of the holes of the rocks."

There still remains to be considered another textual peculiarity of some grammatical impor-

tance. The use of the pronoun by the Septuagint, in many passages, is exceedingly interesting, to say the least. There are a few places where its absence is significant, as "father" for "my father," chap. iii. 19; "mother" for "my mother," chap. xv. 10; "brother" for "my brother," chap. xxii. 18. The simplicity of the expression in each instance seems to indicate its antiquity. At all events, the form in Greek points to a peculiarity of the translator's text. The simpler reading is undoubtedly recensional, and it is apparently ancient.

There are also a good many places where the substitution of a pronoun for an article, or an article for a pronoun, is significant. It is barely possible that occasionally, owing to the genius of his language, the translator may have substituted an article for a pronoun, especially because a few divergences of this kind may be conjecturally explained in this way. It is hardly probable, however, that this was often if, indeed, ever the case. The recensional character of this species of substitution is well illustrated by an instance that occurs in chap. xxvii. 3, where the Greek has a pronoun, but the Massoretic text has neither a pronoun nor an article with the noun "messengers." The construction of the Hebrew, though, absolutely requires either the one or the other, as the accompanying adjective with article indicates; and, since

the noun with article would have been a natural reading, which could have been easily and legitimately reproduced, had it appeared in the original of the Alexandrian text, the presence of the pronoun here in Greek warrants the conclusion that it belonged to the translator's manuscript. The following are the chief examples that occur of the substitution of an article for a pronoun:—

הָאָרֶץ—אַרְצֵךְ ; הֶעָרִים—עָרַיִךְ, iv. 7; הָאֹהֶל—אֹהָלַי, iv. 20; הֶעָרִים—עָרָיו, iv. 26; הַמַּרְעִית—מַרְעִיתָם, x. 21; הַשְּׁכֵנִים—שְׁכֵנַי, xii. 14; הֵמָּה אֹמְרִים—הָאֹמְרִים, xiv. 15; הַבַּחוּרִים—בַּחוּרֵיהֶם, xviii. 21; וְרַחְמָהּ—וְהֶרֶחֶם, xx. 17; הָאֹמְרִים—הֵם אֹמְרִים xxvii. 9.

The substitution of a pronoun for an article in the Septuagint is much more frequent than that of an article for a pronoun. As the Greek was an article-loving as well as a participial-loving language, the greater frequency of the pronoun in the version proves this peculiarity to be unquestionably recensional. Wherever a pronoun in the Greek stands for an article in the Hebrew, as a rule, there is reason to believe that the translator found the form before him in the text he used. The fact, moreover, of its greater frequency in the Hebrew original of the Greek translation suggests

the supposition that the pronoun was much more common in earlier times than was the article, the more frequent use of which may probably have belonged to a later development of the language. If this supposition be correct, it indicates, not only the primitive nature of the Hebrew pronoun, but also the archaic character of the Alexandrian recension. In any case, the textual peculiarity is significant, and worthy of the carefullest consideration. Of this kind of substitution the following instances occur :—

נַפְשָׁם — הַנֶּפֶשׁ, iv. 10 ; בֵּיתִי — הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה, vii. 11 ;
בְּנֵיהֶם — הַבָּנִים ; וַאֲבוֹתֵיהֶם — וְהָאָבוֹת ; וְהַנָּשִׁים —
וּנְשֵׁיהֶם, vii. 18 ; שְׂדֵיהֶם—הַשָּׂדֶה, vii. 20 ; הַדֶּרֶךְ—
דְּרָכַי, vii. 23 ; עַמִּי — הָעָם ; בְּתַרְמִיתָם — בַּתַּרְמִית,
viii. 5 ; שְׁבוּעָתִי — הַשְּׁבוּעָה, xi. 5 ; הַבַּחוּרִים —
בַּחוּרֵיהֶם, xi. 22 ; בְּנַחֲלָתִי—בַּנַּחֲלָה, xii. 14 ; הַמְּלָכִים
— מַלְכֵיהֶם, xiii. 13 ; וַאֲבוֹתֵיהֶם — וְהָאָבוֹת וְהַבָּנִים
וּבְנֵיהֶם, xiii. 14 ; נְבִיאֵיהֶם—הַנְּבִיאִים, xiv. 13 ; בָּרֶכֶב
וּבַסּוּסִים—בְּרִכְבֵיהֶם וּבְסוּסֵיהֶם, xvii. 25 ; יוֹמִי—הַיּוֹם,
xx. 8 ; עַמּוֹ—הָעָם, xxvi. 23 ; xl. 6 ; וְהַנְּבִיאִים—
וּנְבִיאֵיכֶם, xxvii. 15 ; קָדְשׁוֹ — הַקֹּדֶשׁ, xxxi. 23 ;
תּוֹעֲבֹתֵיכֶם—הַתּוֹעֵבָה, xliv. 22 ; סְרִינוֹתֵיכֶם—הַסְּרִינוֹת,
xlvi. 4 ; מִלְחַמְתֵּךְ—הַמִּלְחָמָה, xlix. 26.

Having indicated briefly a very few of the more

important practical results obtained from the investigation, it seems advisable, before presenting the complete Conspectus of the variations, to sum up concisely the general conclusions that have been reached by the present inquiry. Partly by way of recapitulation, therefore, and partly by way of amplification, it will be seen, the following final results are now submitted for careful consideration :—

1. The book of Jeremiah, from the time of its completion and publication, or shortly afterwards, appears to have existed in a twofold form.

2. One edition of his prophecies was possibly authorized in Egypt by the prophet himself, and, therefore, may be called the Egyptian or Alexandrian recension; another edition was probably sanctioned in Babylonia or Palestine by the Jewish Synagogue, and, therefore, may be called the Babylonian or Palestinean recension.

3. The Alexandrian recension represented the shape of the book as it was circulated in Egypt, and as it may have been published by Jeremiah or by Baruch; the Palestinean recension represented the shape of the book as it was circulated in Asia, and as it may have been altered and expanded, during the centuries intervening between the date of the prophet's death and the time of the Septuagint translation, by Jewish copyists or scribes.

4. The version reproduces in substance the Alexandrian recension, and presents, as nearly as can be determined, the norm, or the original form, of the book, as it may have left the hands of the prophet or of his secretary; the Massoretic text reproduces in modified form the Palestinean recension, and presents the shape which that recension had received by glosses and interpolations from the times of Jeremiah to the days of the Massorites.

5. The Septuagint was translated as faithfully as the condition of the ancient Hebrew manuscript would permit, and as literally as the genius of the flexible Greek language would allow, the translator or translators having in no way arbitrarily changed the original Hebrew text, and having in no instance been influenced either by personal scruple, theological bias, or religious tendency.

6. From striking evidence furnished by numerous passages, sometimes because of the different derivation of the same word, and sometimes because of the peculiar use of a similar term, the version seems to have been made by several persons, two or three, at least, apparently having taken part in the work of translation.

7. Although each text contains mistakes, as has repeatedly been shown, yet the Greek translators made mistakes more frequently than did the

Massorites, owing chiefly to the difficulty of translating a badly worn or an indistinctly written manuscript from an unpunctuated or an unpointed text.

8. While both texts have suffered somewhat from the process of transmission, the original of each having, undoubtedly, been more or less corrupt, the Hebrew text in general is in a better condition at present than is the Greek text, owing principally to careful and, perhaps, repeated redaction or revision.

9. By applying the general principles of variation deduced and demonstrated in the foregoing discussion, corruptions and imperfections in both texts may be discovered and explained, the one text helping to correct the errors or to rectify the mistakes in the other text.

10. After making due allowance for the various causes of divergence, some of which are true of all the books, and all of which are true of some of the books, of the Old Testament, the Septuagint translation will be found to be of the utmost value for the purposes of text-criticism.

CHAPTER X.

THE CONSPECTUS OF THE VARIATIONS.

CAPUT I.

1	דִּבְרֵי ירמיהו	דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָיָה אֶל־ירמיהו[a]
	אשר בענתות	אשר יָשַׁב[b] בענתות
2	אשר	כַּאשר (אשר)
	אמוץ	אמץ (אמוץ)
3	עד־תֹּם	עד
	עד־גְלוֹת	עד־גָּלוּת[c]
4	אלַי לֵאמֹר	אֵלָיו
6	אֲהָהּ	אַתָּה (הָהּ אַתָּה)[d]
7	עַל־כל	אֶל־כל
	וְאֵת כל	וּכְכָל
9	את־ידו	את־ידו אֵלַי[e]
10	היום הַזֶּה	היום[f]
	על־הַגוים ועל־הַממלכות	על־גוים ועל־ממלכות
	וְלַהֲרוֹס[g]	Desunt
11	יִרְמְיָהוּ	
	אֲנִי רֹאֶה[h]	
12	על־דברִי לעשֹׂתוֹ	על־דבָרַי[i] לעשֹׂתָם
13	אלי שנית	שנית אלי
	אֲנִי רֹאֶה[k]	Deest

[a] ut Hos. 1 : 1; Joel 1 : 1; Micah 1 : 1; Zeph. 1 : 1. [b] Targ. דְּקַבֵּל אַחְסַנְתֵּיהּ. [c] ut Ezek. 1 : 2. [d] Cf. 4 : 10; 14 : 13; 32 : 17. [e] ut Ezek. 2 : 9. [f] ut vs. 18. [g] ut 18 : 7. [h] ut 24 : 3. [i] Targ. פִּתְגָּמַי. [k] ut 24 : 3.

14	תִּפָּתַח	תֻּפַּח
15	לְכָל־מִשְׁפְּחוֹת מַמְלְכוֹת צָפוֹנָה	לְכָל־מַמְלְכוֹת הָאָרֶץ[a] מִצָּפוֹן
	וְעַל כָּל־חוֹמֹתֶיהָ סָבִיב	וְעַל כָּל הַחוֹמוֹת סְבִיבֶיהָ
17	אֲלֵיהֶם	Deest
	אַל־תֵּחַת מִפְּנֵיהֶם פֶּן־אֲחִתְּךָ לִפְנֵיהֶם	אַל־תִּירָא מִפְּנֵיהֶם וְאַל־תֵּחַת[b] מִפְּנֵיהֶם כִּי אִתְּךָ אֲנִי לְהַצִּילֶךָ נְאֻם־יְהוָה[c]
18	וַאֲנִי	Deest
	הַיּוֹם	הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה[d]
	וּלְעַמּוּד בַּרְזֶל וּלְחֹמוֹת נְחֹשֶׁת עַל־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ לְמַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה	וּלְחֹמַת[e] נְחֹשֶׁת בְּצוּרָה[f] לְכָל־מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה
	לְכֹהֲנֶיהָ	Deest
19	נְאֻם־יְהוָה לְהַצִּילֶךָ	לְהַצִּילֶךָ אָמַר יְהוָה

CAPUT II.

1	וַיְהִי דְבַר־יְהוָה אֵלַי לֵאמֹר	Desunt
2	הָלֹךְ וְקָרָאתָ בְאָזְנֵי יְרוּשָׁלִַם	
	לֵאמֹר	וַיֹּאמַר
	זָכַרְתִּי לָךְ	זכרתי
	לֶכְתֵּךְ אַחֲרַי בַּמִּדְבָּר בְּאֶרֶץ לֹא זְרוּעָה	לכתך אַחֲרַי קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל אָמַר יְהוָה
3	רָעָה תָּבֹא אֲלֵיהֶם	רעה תבוא עֲלֵיהֶם[g]
	נְאֻם־יְהוָה	אָמַר[h] יהוה
4	וְכָל־מִשְׁפְּחוֹת	וְכָל־מִשְׁפַּחַת[i]
6	וְשׁוּחָה בְּאֶרֶץ צִיָּה וְצַלְמָוֶת	וְשַׁמָּה בארץ ציה וְגַלְמוּד
7	אֶרֶץ הַכַּרְמֶל	הכרמל
9	נְאֻם־יְהוָה[k]	Deest
11	הַהֵימִיר גּוֹי אֱלֹהִים	הֶהֵמִירוּ גוֹיִם[l] אֱלֹהֵיהֶם

[a] ut 15:4; 24:9 etc. [b] Cf. 23:4; 30:10; 46:27; Deut. 1:21 etc. [c] ut vss. 8, 19. [d] ut vs. 10.—Targ. יוֹמָא דֵין. [e] Targ. וּכְשׁוּר. [f] Cf. 15: 20. [g] Targ. עֲלֵיהוֹן. [h] Targ. אֲמַר. [i] Targ. זַרְעִית. [k] Alex. אָמַר יהוה. [l] Targ. עַמְמַיָּא לָא שְׁבָקוּ.

12	חָרְבוּ מאד	הַרְבֵּה מאד[a]
13	לַחְצֹב להם בארות בֹּארֹת	וַיַּחְצְבוּ להם בארות
	לֹא־יָכִלוּ המים	לֹא־יָכְלוּ לְהָכִיל המים[b]
15	נָתְנוּ	וְיִתְּנוּ[c]
	עריו נִצְּתָה	וְעריו נִתְּצוּ[d]
16	יִרְעוּךְ קָדְקֹד	יְדָעוּךְ וַיִּצְחֲקוּ לָךְ[e] (וַיְנַדְּפוּךְ)
17	עזבך אֶת־יהוה אלהיך בְּעֵת מוֹלִכֵךְ בַּדָּרֶךְ	עזבך אֹתִי נְאֻם־יהוה אלהָיִךְ
18	לדרך מצרים	וּלדרך מצרים
	מי שִׁחוֹר	מי גִיחוֹן
	לדרך אשור	וּלדרך אשור
	מי נָהָר	מי נְהָרוֹת[f]
19	תיסרך רעתך וּמשבותיך תוכחך	תיסרך משבותיך וְרעתך תוכחך
	כִּי־רַע וָמָר עזבך אֶת־יהוה אלהיך	כי מַר עזבך אֹתִי נְאֻם־יהוה אלהיך
	ולא פַחְדָּתִי אֵלַיִךְ	ולא בָחַרְתִּי בָךְ (אֹתָךְ)
	יְהוִֹה צְבָאוֹת	אֱלֹהָיִךְ
20	שברתי . . . נתקתי	שברתי . . . נתקתי
	לא אעבוד	לא אעבוד לָךְ
	כי על־כל	כי אֵלֵךְ על־כל
	כל־עץ רַעֲנָן	כל־עץ עָבֹת[g]
	אַתְּ צֹעָה זנה	שָׁם אֶתְצָעָה (= אֶצְטָעָה) זנה (אֶשָּׁפֵךְ בְּתַזְנוּתַי[h])
21	שורק כלה זרע אמת לִי סוּרֵי	שורק זרע (גֶּפֶן פּוֹרִיָּה) כלה אמת לָמָר (לְמְרִי?)
22	נכתם עוֹנֵךְ	נכתמת בַּעֲוֹנוֹתַיִךְ
	אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה	יְהוָֹה
23	הַבְּעָלִים	הַבַּעַל[i]
	דַּרְכֵּךְ	דְּרָכַיִךְ
	דְּעִי	וּדְעִי

[a] ut Gen. 15:1; 41:49 etc. [b] ut II. Chron. 7:7.—Targ. הֲלָא יָכְלִין לְקַיָּמָא מַיָּא. [c] Targ. יְרִימוּן. [d] Targ. צַדְיָן. [e] Targ. וְיִבְזוּן נִכְסָךְ. [f] Cf. Ps. 137:1. [g] ut Ezek. 20 : 28 (Gk. & Heb.). [h] Cf. Ezek. 16 : 15. [i] Targ. טָעֲוַת.

	בִּכְרָה קַלָּה מְשָׂרֶכֶת דרכיה׃	בָּעֶרֶב קָלָה מַשְׂרֶקֶת׃ דרכיה[a]
24	פֶּרֶה לִמֻּד מדבר	פָּרְעָה (פָּתָא = פָּתָה) לְמֵי־מדבר
	שָׁאֲפָה רוח	סָחְפָה רוח (נִסְחֲפָה בָרוח)
	תַּאֲנָתָהּ	נִתְּנָה
	בְּחֹדְשָׁה	בְהָדְשָׁה (בְּהָדְשָׁה)
25	מִיַּחֵף	(מִיַּעַף?) מִדֶּרֶךְ מוֹקֵשׁ[b]
	ותאמְרִי נוֹאָשׁ לוֹא	ותאמַר אֶתְאוֹשֵׁשׁ (נוֹאשׁ לִי)
	אָהַבְתִּי	אֲהֵבָה
	אֵלֵךְ	הָלָכָה
26	בֵּית ישראל	בְּנֵי ישראל
	מלכיהם שריהם	וּמלכיהם וְשריהם
27	אמרים לעץ אבי אתה	לעץ אמרים כִּי אבי אתה
	ילדתָנוּ°	ילדתִּנִי
	פנו אֵלַי	פנו עָלַי
	פָּנִים	פְּנֵיהֶם[c]
28	יקומו אם־יושיעוּךָ	אם־יקומו וְיושיעו
	כי מספר עריך היו אלהיך יהודה	כי מספר עריך היו אלהיך יהודה
		וּמִסְפַּר חֻצוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַםִ קִטְּרוּ לַבָּעַל[d]
29	תָּרִיבוּ	תְּדַבְּרוּ (תְּדוֹבְבוּ?)
	כלכם פשעתם בי	כלכם פשעתם וְכֻלְּכֶם בְּגַדְתֶּם בי
30	לָקָחוּ	לְקַחְתֶּם
	אכלה חַרְבְּכֶם	אכלה חֶרֶב
	כאריה משחית׃	כאריה משחית וְלֹא יְרֵאתֶם׃
31	הַדּוֹר אַתֶּם רְאוּ דבר־יהוה	שִׁמְעוּ[e] דבר־יהוה כֹּה אָמַר יְהֹוָה
	רדנו לוא־נבוא עוד אליך	הֲלֹא רדנו וְלוא־נבוא אליך עוד
32	התשכח בתולה עדיה כלה קשריה	התשכח כלה עדיה בתולה קשריה
33	מה תיטבי דַּרְכֵּךְ	מה עוֹד תיטבי דְּרָכַיִךְ (בִּדְרָכַיִךְ[f])
	לָכֵן גַּם אֶת־הָרָעוֹת לִמַּדְתְּי° את־דרכיך	לֹא־כֵן כִּי גַּם־אַתְּ הֵרֵעוֹת לְטַמֵּא את־דרכיך

[a] Inc. vs. 24. [b] Targ. מִלְאִתְחַבָּרָא לְעַמְמַיָּא. [c] Targ. אַפֵּיהוֹן. [d] Cf. 11 : 13. [e] Inc. vs. 31.—Targ. קַבִּילוּ. [f] Targ. בְּאוֹרְחָתַיִךְ.

34	בִּכְנָפַיִךְ	בְּכַפַּיִךְ
	דַּם	דְּמֵי[a]
	אֶבְיוֹנִים	Deest
	לֹא־בַמַּחְתֶּרֶת	לֹא־בַמַּחְתֹּרֹת
	עַל־כָּל־אֵלֶּה	עַל־כָּל־אֵלֶּה
36	מַה־תֵּזְלִי מְאֹד לְשַׁנּוֹת	כִּי תָזֹלִּי מאד לְשַׁנּוֹת
37	גם מאת זה	כִּי גם מאת זה
	במבטחיך	במבטחך[b]
	תצליחי לָהֶם	תצליחי לוֹ

CAPUT III.

1	לֵאמֹר הֵן	אִם (הֵן)
	הֲיָשׁוּב אֵלֶיהָ עוד	הֲשׁוֹב תָּשׁוּב אֵלָיו עוד
	הָאָרֶץ ההיא	הָאִשָּׁה ההיא
	רֵעִים רבים	רֹעִים רבים
	וְשׁוֹב	וַתָּשׁוּבִי (וְתָשׁוּבִי)
2	עַל־שְׁפָיִם	אֶל־שְׁפִי
	עַל־דרכים	עַל־הַדרכים
	כַּעֲרָבִי בַּמדבר	כְּעֹרֵב (ב)מדבר[c]
	וברעתך	וברעֹתַיִךְ
3	וימנעו רְבִבִים וּמַלְקוֹשׁ לוֹא הָיָה	וימנו (ויִהיו) רֹעִים רַבִּים לְמוֹקֵשׁ לָךְ[d]
	וּמֵצַח אשה זונה	פְּנֵי (מצח) אשה זונה
	מֵאַנְתְּ הִכָּלֵם	מֵאַיִן תִּכָּלְמִי מִפְּנֵי־(בִּפְנֵי־)כֹּל
4	הלוא מֵעַתָּה קראתִי[e] לי אבי	הלוא מְעֹנָה קראת לי וְאב וְאַלּ־ה
	אלוף נעורי אָתָּה	נעוריךְ (נְעוּרוֹתַיִךְ, נְעוּרוֹתַיִךְ)
5	הרעות	הרעות הָאֵלֶּה
6	עשתה	עשתה לִּי
	מְשֻׁבָה	יֹשֶׁבֶת[e] (מוֹשָׁבָה)
	הֹלְכָה הִיא	הָלְכִי[f]

[a] Cf. Gen. 4: 10, 11; I. Kings 2 : 5. [b] Targ. רוחצניך. [c] Cf. Ps. 102: 7.
[d] Cf. 23: 1 seq. [e] Vid. vss. 8, 12. [f] Targ. אָזְלִין אַנְתְּ.

Verse		
	ותזני־שם	ותזנינה־שם
7	עשתה	הזנותה[b]
	תשוב	תשובי (שובי)
	ותראה בגודה אחותה יהודה	ותראה בדה בגודה יהודה
8	על־כל־אדות אשר נאפה משבה ישראל	על־כל־אדות אשר־נתפשה באשר נאפה ישבת[c] ישראל
	שלחתיה	ושלחתיה
	ואתן את־ספר כריתתיה אליה	ואתן לה ספר כריתת[d] בידיה[e]
	אחותה	Deest
9	והיה מקל זנותה	ותהי מקל[f] זנותה
	ותחנף את־הארץ ותנאף את־האבן ואת־העץ	ותנאף את־העץ ואת־האבן
10	וגם־בכל־זאת	ובכל־זאת
	אחותה	Desunt
	נאם־יהוה	
11	צדקה נפשה משבה ישראל	צדק נפשו ישראל
12	שובה משבה ישראל	שובה אלי ישבת ישראל[g]
	לוא־אפיל פני בכם	ולוא אשים פני עליכם[h]
	לא אטור	ולא אטור לכם[i]
13	לא־שמעתם	לא־שמעת
14	ציון	אל־ציון[k]
15	דעה והשכיל	רעה (רעים) בהשכיל
16	בארץ בימים ההמה נאם־יהוה	על־הארץ נאם־יהוה בימים ההמה
	ברית יהוה	ברית קדוש ישראל
	ולא יעלה על־לב ולא יזכרו־בו ולא יפקדו	לא יעלה על־לב לא יזכר ולא יפקד
17	בעת ההיא	בימים ההם ובעת ההיא[l]
	ונקוו אליה כל־הגוים	ונקוו כל־הגוים אליה
	לשם יהוה לירושלם	Deest

[a] Targ. ופלחין. [b] ut Lev. 19 : 29; II. Chron. 21 : 13. [c] Vid. vss. 6, 12. [d] Targ. אגרת גט פטורין. [e] ut Deut. 24 : 1. [f] Targ. מקלילא. [g] Vid. vss. 6, 8. [h] ut II. Kings 8 : 11. [i] Cf. Nahum 1 : 2. [k] Targ. לציון. [l] ut 33 : 15; 50 : 4, 20.

	שְׁרִרוּת	מוֹעֲצוֹת
18	מארץ צפון	מארץ צפון וּמִכֹּל הָאֲרָצוֹת[a]
	אבותיכם	אבותיהם[b]
19	אֵיךְ	אָמֵן יְהוָה כִּי[c]
	נחלת צְבִי	נחלת אֱלֹהִים[d]
	אָבִי תקראִי־לי	אב תקרא־לי (תִּקְרְאוּנִי)
	תשובִי	תשובוּ
20	אָכֵן בגדה אשה מֵרעה	אַךְ כְּמוֹ בגדה אשה בְּרעה[e]
	בְּגַדְתֶּם	בָּגְדָה
21	על־שְׁפָיִים	מִשְׁפָּם
	תחנוני	וְתחנוני[f]
	דרכָּם	דרכֵיהֶם
	אלהיהם	אלהי קָדְשָׁם[g]
22	ארפה מְשׁוּבֹתֵיכם	וְארפה שִׁבְרֵיכם[h]
	אֶתָנוּ לך	עֲבָדִים (נְתוּנִים) לך[i]
23	מִגבעות	הַגבעות
	המון	וְהמון
24	את־בניהם	וְאת־בניהם[k]
25	וּתכסנו	נִתכסנו

CAPUT IV.

1	תָּשׁוּב . . . תָּשׁוּב	יָשׁוּב . . . יָשׁוּב
	ואם תָּסִיר שקוציך מפָּנַי	ואם־יָסִיר שקוּצָיו מִפִּיו[l]
	וְלֹא תָנוּד	וּמִפָּנַי יָגוּר
2	ונשבעתָּ	ונשבע
	יִתְהַלָּלוּ	יְהַלְלוּ אֶת־אֱלֹהִים בִּירוּשָׁלָםִ
3	לְאִישׁ יהודה וְלִירושלם	לְאַנְשֵׁי יהודה וּלְיֹשְׁבֵי ירושלם[m]
	אֶל־קצים	עַל־קצים

[a] ut 16: 15; 23 : 8 etc. [b] Targ. אֲבָהָתְהוֹן. [c] Cf. 11 : 5. [d] ut II. Sam. 20 : 19; 21 : 3. [e] Targ. כְּמָא דִמְשַׁקְרָא אִתְּתָא בְּבַעְלַהּ. [f] Targ. וּמִתְאַנְחִין. [g] Cf. Hab. 1 : 12. [h] ut 6 : 14; 8 : 11; Zech. 11 : 16; Ps. 60 : 4; 147 : 3. [i] תַּבְנָא לְפוּלְחָנָךְ. [k] Targ. וְיַת בְּנֵיהוֹן. [l] Cf. Zech. 9 : 7. [m] ut 11:2, 9.—Targ. וּלְיָתְבֵי יְרוּשְׁלֵם.

4	לַיהוָה	לֵאלֹהֵיכֶם
	עָרְלוֹת	עָרְלַת (עַרְלוּת, קְשִׁי[a])
	אִישׁ יהודה	אַנְשֵׁי יהודה
5	ובירושלם הַשְׁמִיעוּ	וְיִשָּׁמַע בִּירושלם
	וְאִמְרוּ	אמרו
	ותקעו שופר בָּארץ	תקעו עַל־הָארץ (בארץ) שופר
	מַלְאוּ	מָלֵא[b] (מְאֹד)
	וְאִמְרוּ	אמרו
6	שאו נֵס	הִנָּשְׂאוּ[c](?) (שאו) וְנֻסוּ
7	נסע יצא	נסע וְיצא (וַיֵּצֵא)
	אַרְצֵךְ	הָאָרֶץ
	עָרַיִךְ	וְהֶעָרִים
	מאין יושב	מאין יושב בָּהֶן
8	עַל־זֹאת	עַל־אֵלֶּה
	ספדו	וְספדו
	חֲרוֹן	Deest
	מִמֶּנּוּ	מִכֶּם
9	וְנָשַׁמּוּ הכהנים	והכהנים יָשֹׁמּוּ
10	אֲהָהּ	אַתָּה[d]
	לָכֶם	Deest
	ונגעה	וְהִנֵּה[e] נגעה
	עַד־הַנָּפֶשׁ	עַד־נַפְשָׁם
11	יֵאָמֵר	יֹאמְרוּ
	רוח צַח שְׁפָיִם	רוח תּוֹעָה (סוּפָה)
	לוא לִזְרוֹת	לוא לְזַכּוֹת
12	מֵאֵלֶּה	Deest
	משפטים	משפטי[f]
13	כַּעֲנָנִים	כְּעָנָן[g]
15	מדן	מדן יָבוֹא
	וּמַשְׁמִיעַ	וְיִשָּׁמַע
	מֵהַר	מֵהָרֵי

[a] Targ. רְשַׁע. [b] ut 12:6. [c] ἀναλαβόντες. [d] Cf. 1:6; 14:13; 32:17. [e] Targ. וּבְכֵן. [f] Targ. פּוּרְעָנוּת דִּינֵי. [g] ut Ezek. 38:9, 16. Targ. כַּעֲנָנָא.

16	הנה	הנה בָאו (בָאִים)
	עַל־ירושלם	בִּירושלם
	נֹצְרים	צֹרְרים (צָרים)
	מארץ הַמרחק	מארץ מרחק[a]
17	מְרָתָה	מְרִיתְ[b]
18	דַּרְכֵּךְ	דְּרָכַיִךְ
19	קִירות לבי הומֶה־לִּי לבי	וְקִירות לבי הומָה נַפְשִׁי יִרְגַז (יִגְעַשׁ, יִתְגָּעַשׁ) לבי
	שָׁמַעַתְּי	שֹׁמְעָה (שמעת)[c]
20	שבר עַל־שֶׁבר נקרא	וְשֹׁד שבר נקרא
	שֻׁדְּדוּ אֹהָלַי רֶגַע יריעתי	שֻׁדַּד הָאֹהֶל (אֹהָלִי) רְגָעַי (רְגָעַי) יריעתי
21	אראה־נֵס	אראה־נֵס (נִסִּים)
	אֶשְׁמְעָה קול שופר	שׁוֹמֵעַ קול שופרות (שופר)
22	כי אֱוִיל עמי	כי אֵילַי[d] (אוּלַי) עמי
	ולא נבונים הֵמָּה	ולא נבונים
23	ראיתי אֶת־הארץ והנה־תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ	ראיתי עַל־הארץ והנה אֵיתֶנָה (אֵין)
24	וְהִנֵּה רעשים	וְהֵמָּה רעשים
	התקַלְקָלוּ	(התחַלְחָלוּ) מִתְחַלְחְלִים
25	אין הָאדם	אין אדם
26	הַמדבר	מדבר[e]
	וכל־עָרָיו נִתְּצוּ	וכל־הֶעָרִים נִצְּתוּ בָאֵשׁ[f]
	מפני חרון אפו	וּמפני חרון אפו אָבֵדוּ (כָּלוּ)
27	כִּי־כֹה אמר	כֹּה אמר
28	כי־דברתי זמתי ולא נחמתי ולא־אשוב ממנה	כי־דברתי ולא נחמתי זמתי ולא־אשוב ממנה
29	וְרֹמֵה קשת ברחת כל־הָעִיר	וקשת דְּרוּכָה ברחת כל־הָאָרֶץ[g]
	באו בֶּעָבִים ובכפים	באו בְּחֹרִים (בִּמְעָרוֹת) וּבְיְעָרִים (וּבֶעָבִים) נֶחְבְּאוּ[h] וְעַל־כֵּפִים
	כל־הָעִיר עזובה	כל־עיר עזובה

[a] ut 6: 20.—Targ. מֵאֲרַע רְחִיקָא. [b] Targ. סָרֵיבְתְּ. [c] Targ. שְׁמָעַת. [d] Cf. II Kings 24: 15. [e] Targ. מַדְבְּרָא. [f] ut 49: 2; 51: 58. [g] Targ. כָּל יָתְבֵי אַרְעָא. [h] Targ. לְאִטַּמָּרָא.

	וְאֵין־יוֹשֵׁב	אֵין־יוֹשֵׁב
30	שָׁדוּד	Deest
	כִּי־תַעְדִּי	וְתַעְדִּי
	תִּתְיַפִּי	יָפְיֵךְ
	עֹגְבִים	עֹגְבַיִךְ[a]
31	צָרָה	צַעֲקָתֵךְ
	תְּפָרֵשׂ כַּפֶּיהָ	וּתְפָרֵשׂ כַּפֶּיהָ[b]
	לְהֹרְגִים	לַהֲרֻגִים (עַל־הַהֲרֻגִים)

CAPUT V.

1	וּרְאוּ־נָא	וּרְאוּ
	אִם־תִּמְצְאוּ אִישׁ אִם־יֵשׁ	אִם־תִּמְצְאוּ אִם־יֵשׁ (אִישׁ = אִם־יֵשׁ)
	מְבַקֵּשׁ	וּמְבַקֵּשׁ
	וְאֶסְלַח לָהּ	וְאֶסְלַח לָהֶם[c] (אָמַר) נְאֻם־יְהוָה
2	וְאִם	Deest
	לַשֶּׁקֶר	לֹא (ל)שֶׁקֶר
3	הֲלוֹא	Deest
	מֵאֲנוּ (bis)	וּמֵאֲנוּ (וַיְמָאֲנוּ) (bis)
4	נוֹאֲלוּ	כִּי לֹא־יָכְלוּ (נִלְאוּ, נוֹחֲלוּ)[d]
	מִשְׁפַּט אֱלֹהֵיהֶם	וּמִשְׁפַּט אֱלֹהִים[e]
5	מִשְׁפַּט אֱלֹהֵיהֶם אַךְ הֵמָּה	וּמִשְׁפַּט אֱלֹהִים[f] וְהִנֵּה
6	אַרְיֵה מִיַּעַר זְאֵב עֲרָבוֹת	אַרְיֵה מֵהַיַּעַר וּזְאֵב עַד־בַּיִת
	נָמֵר שֹׁקֵד	וְנָמֵר שֹׁקֵד
	כָּל־הַיּוֹצֵא מֵהֵנָּה יִטָּרֵף	כָּל־הַיּוֹצְאִים מֵהֵנָּה יִטָּרְפוּ
	כִּי רַבּוּ	כִּי רְבוּ[g]
	מְשׁוּבוֹתֵיהֶם	בִּמְשׁוּבוֹתֵיהֶם
7	וָאַשְׂבִּעַ אוֹתָם	וָאַשְׂבִּעַ[h] אוֹתָם
	וּבֵית זוֹנָה יִתְגּוֹדָדוּ	וּבְבָתֵּי זוֹנוֹת יִתְגּוֹרְרוּ (יִתְלוֹנָנוּ)
8	סוּסִים מְיֻזָּנִים מַשְׁכִּים הָיוּ	סוּסִים זוֹנִים[i] (מְזַנִּים, מַזְנִים) הָיוּ

---

[a] Targ. רַחֲמָךְ. [b] Targ. וּפָרְסָא יְדָהָא. [c] Targ. לְהוֹן. [d] Cf. Ezek. 19 : 5.
[e] Targ. אוֹרְחָן דְּתַקְנָן קֳדָם יְיָ. [f] Vid. vs. 4. [g] ut Ps. 44 : 13. [h] Targ. שׂוֹבַעַת.
[i] Targ. אַגְרִידִין.

	אֶל־אשת	עַל־אשת[a]
10	עלו בְשָׂרוֹתיה	עלו עַל־שָׂרוֹתיה
	הָסִירוּ נְטִישׁוֹתיה כי לוא ליהוה המה	הַשְׁאִירוּ (הוֹתִירוּ) יְסוֹדוֹתיה (אָשְׁיוֹתיה)[b] כי ליהוה המה
11	בגוד בגדו בי בית ישראל ובית יהודה נאם־יהוה	בגוד בָּגְדָה בי נאם־יהוה בית ישראל ובית יהודה
12	כִּחֲשׁוּ ביהוָֹה	כִּחֵשׁ באדֹנָיו
13	וְהַנְּבִיאִים יִהְיוּ לרוח	נביאֵינוּ הָיוּ לרוח
	וְהַדִּבֵּר	וּדְבַר יְהוָֹה
	כֹּה יֵעָשֶׂה לָהֶם	Desunt
14	אֱלֹהֵי	
	דַּבֶּרְכֶם	דִּבַּרְתֶּם
	הִנְנִי נֹתֵן	הִנֵּה נָתַתִּי
	לְאֵשׁ	אש
15	גּוֹי אֵיתָן הוּא גּוֹי מֵעוֹלָם הוּא	Deest
	גוי לא תֵדַע לשונו ולא תשמע מַה־יְּדַבֵּר	גוי אֲשֶׁר לא תשמע קול לשונו[c] (שְׂפָתוֹ)
16	אַשְׁפָּתוֹ כְּקֶבֶר פָּתוּחַ	Deest
17	ואָכַל קצירך ולחמך יאכלו בָּנֶיךָ ובנותיך יאכל צאנך ובקרך יאכל גפנך ותאנתך יְרֹשֵׁשׁ ערי מבצריך אשר אתה בֹּטֵחַ בהנה בחרב	ואכלו קצירכם ולחמיכם וְאָכְלוּ בְּנֵיכֶם ובנותיכם וְאָכְלוּ צֹאנְכֶם ובקריכם וְאָכְלוּ (גַּפְנֵיכֶם) כַּרְמֵיכֶם ותאניכם וְזֵיתֵיכֶם ויורששו (וְיָרְשׁוּ) ערי מבצריכם אשר אתם בֹּטְחִים (בְּטַחְתֶּם) בהנה בחרב
18	וגם בימים ההמה נאם־יהוה לא־אעשה אתכם כלה	וְהָיָה בימים ההמה נאם־יהוה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לא־אעשה אֶתכם לְכלה[d]
19	כַּאשר עֲזַבְתֶּם אוֹתִי וַתַּעַבְדוּ	כַּאשר עֲבַדְתֶּם
	בְּאֶרֶץ	בָּאָרֶץ
20	בבית יעקב	אֶל־בית יעקב
	וְהַשְׁמִיעוּהָ בִיהודה לֵאמֹר	וְיִשָּׁמַע בְּבֵית־יְהוּדָה[e]
22	אשר־שַׂמְתִּי	אשר־שָׂם (הַשָּׂם)

[a] Targ. עַל אַתַּת. [b] ut 50: 15. [c] Cf. Deut. 28: 49. [d] ut Ezek. 13: 13; II. Chron. 12: 12. [e] Targ. בְּדְבֵית יְהוּדָה.

	ויתגעשו ולא יוכלו	ויתגעש ולא יוכל
23	סָרוּ	וַיָּסוּרוּ
24	הַנֹּתֵן	הַנּוֹתֵן לָנוּ
	וְיוֹרֶה	יוֹרֶה
	בְּעִתּוֹ שְׁבֻעֹת חֻקּוֹת קָצִיר יִשְׁמָר־לָנוּ	בְּעֵת שְׂבֻעַת[a] חֻקַּת קָצִיר וְיִשְׁמָר־לָנוּ
26	יָשׁוּר כְּשַׁךְ יְקוּשִׁים הִצִּיבוּ מַשְׁחִית אֲנָשִׁים יִלְכֹּדוּ	וִיקוּשִׁים הִצִּיבוּ (וּמוֹקְשִׁים יַצִּיבוּ) לְהַשְׁחִית[b] אֲנָשִׁים וַיִּלְכְּדוּ
27	כִּכְלוּב	כְּפַח נִצָּב (כְּרֶשֶׁת פְּרוּשָׂה)
28	שָׁמְנוּ עָשְׁתוּ גַּם עָבְרוּ דִבְרֵי־רָע דִּין	וַיַּעַבְרוּ דִין[c]
	וְיַצְלִיחוּ	Deest
	אֶבְיוֹנִים	אַלְמָנָה
30	בָּאָרֶץ	עַל־הָאָרֶץ
31	נִבְּאוּ בַשֶּׁקֶר	נִבְּאוּ שֶׁקֶר[d]
	יִרְדּוּ עַל־יְדֵיהֶם	יִמְחֲאוּ יְדֵיהֶם (יִרְדּוּ בִידֵיהֶם)
	אָהֲבוּ	אָהֵב
	לְאַחֲרִיתָהּ	לְאַחֲרִית[e]

CAPUT VI.

1	הָעִיזוּ	הָעֹז
2	הַנָּוָה וְהַמְּעֻנָּגָה דָּמִיתִי בַּת־צִיּוֹן	נִהְיָה הָרָמָה[f] (רָמְתִי) בַּת־צִיּוֹן (וְעָבְרָה רָמָתֵךְ)
3	תָּקְעוּ	וְתִקְעוּ
	רָעוּ אִישׁ אֶת־יָדוֹ	וְרָעוּ[g] (וְיִרְעוּ) אִישׁ בְּיָדוֹ
4	קַדְּשׁוּ עָלֶיהָ מִלְחָמָה	הִתְקַדְּשׁוּ עָלֶיהָ לְמִלְחָמָה
	וְנַעֲלֶה	וְנַעֲלֶה עָלֶיהָ[h]
	כִּי־יִנָּטוּ צִלְלֵי־עָרֶב	כִּי־יִנָּטוּ צִלְלֵי־יוֹם
5	וְנַעֲלֶה	וְנַעֲלֶה עָלֶיהָ[i]

---

[a] Cf. Ezek. 16:49. [b] Targ. לְחַבָּלָא. [c] Targ. עֲבַרוּ עַל־פִּתְגָּמֵי אוֹרַיְתָא. [d] Targ. מִתְנַבַּן שִׁקְרָא. [e] Targ. לְסוֹפָא. [f] τὸ ὕψος. [g] Targ. וְסַיְעִין. [h] Vid. vs. 5. [i] Vid. vs. 4.

	אַרְמְנוֹתֶיהָ	יְסוֹדוֹתֶיהָ (מוֹסְדוֹתֶיהָ)
6	צְבָאוֹת	Deest
	כִּרְתוּ עֵצָה וְשִׁפְכוּ עַל־ירושלם	קְרֹת עֵצָה שְׁפֹךְ עַל־ירושלם חַיִל
	סֹלְלָה הִיא הָעִיר הָפְקַד	(חַיִל) הוֹי עִיר הַשֶּׁקֶר כָּל־עֹשֶׁק
	כֻּלָּהּ עֹשֶׁק בקרבה	בקרבה
7	כהקיר בוֹר מֵימֶיהָ	כהקיר בור מַיִם
	עַל־פָּנַי	עַל־פָּנֶיהָ
	חלי ומכה	בָּחלי וּבמכה
8	הִוָּסְרִי ירושלם	תּוּסַר ירושלם
9	כֹּה־אמר יהוה צְבָאוֹת	כִּי כֹה־אמר יהוה
	עוֹלֵל יְעוֹלְלוּ	עוֹלְלוּ עוללו
	הָשֵׁב יָדְךָ	הָשִׁיבוּ
	עַל־סלסלות	עַל־סלסלו (— סַלּוֹ)
10	עַל־מי אדברה	אֶל־מי אדברה
	וישמָעוּ	וישמַע
11	חֲמַת יְהוָֹה מלאתי נִלְאֵיתִי הָכִיל	חֲמָתִי מלאתי וָאֶתְאַפַּק וְכִלִּיתִים
	שְׁפֹךְ עַל־עולל	אֶשְׁפֹּךְ עַל־עולל
	כִּי־גַם־אִישׁ עִם־אִשָּׁה	כִּי־אִישׁ וְאִשָּׁה
	מלא ימים	מְלֵאֵי ימים
12	שָׂדוֹת וְנָשִׁים יַחְדָּו	שְׂדוֹתֵיהֶם וּנְשׁוֹתֵיהֶם יַחַד
	עַל־ישבי הארץ	עַל־ישבי הארץ הַזֹּאת
13	כִּי מִקְּטַנָּם וְעַד־גְּדוֹלָם כֻּלּוֹ	כִּי מקטנם ועד־גָּדוֹל[a] כֻּלָּם[b] בָּצְעוּ
	בּוֹצֵעַ בצע וּמִנָּבִיא ועד־כֹּהֵן	בצע מכהן ועד־נביא (נביא
	כֻּלּוֹ עֹשֶׂה שקר	הַשֶּׁקֶר) כֻּלָּם עֹשִׂים שקר[c]
14	בַּת־עמי עַל־נְקַלָּה לֵאמֹר	עמי מְקַלִּים וְאֹמְרִים[d]
	וְאֵין שלום	וְאַיֵּה (וְאָן) שלום
15	תּוֹעֵבָה עָשׂוּ	כָּלוּ (אָבְדוּ)
	גַּם־בּוֹשׁ לֹא־יֵבֹשׁוּ גַּם־הַכְלִים	וְלֹא כְבוֹשִׁים יבושו גַּם־כְּלִמָּתָם
	לא ידעו לכן יפלו בַנֹּפְלִים	(הַכְּלִמָּה) לא ידעו לכן יפלוּ
	בְּעֵת־פְּקַדְתִּים יִכָּשְׁלוּ	בְּנָפְלָם וּבְעֵת־פְקֻדָּה[e] יֹאבְדוּ
16	לנתבות עוֹלם	לנתבות יְהוָֹה עולם[f] וּרְאוּ
	דֶּרֶךְ הטוב	הַדֶּרֶךְ הטוב

---

[a] ut 8:10. [b] Targ. פּוּלְהוֹן. [c] Targ. כּוּלְהוֹן עָבְדֵי שְׁקַר. [d] Vid. 7:4.
[e] Alex. בְּעֵת־פְּקֻדָּתָם. [f] Cf. Gen. 21:33.

	מַרְגּוֹעַ לְנַפְשְׁכֶם	כֹּפֶר[a] לְנַפְשׁוֹתֵיכֶם
17	הקשיבו לקול שופר	הקשיבו לקול הַשּׁוֹפָר
18	שִׁמְעוּ הגוים וּדְעִי עֵדָה אֶת־	שִׁמְעוּ הגוים וְרֹעֵי עֶדְרָם
	אֲשֶׁר־בָּם	
19	שִׁמְעִי הָאָרֶץ	שִׁמְעִי אֶרֶץ[b]
	אנכי מביא רָעָה אֶל־העם הזה	אנכי מביא עַל[c]־העם הזה רעה
	פרי מַחְשְׁבוֹתָם	פרי מְשׁוּבָתָם[d]
	וַיִּמְאֲסוּ־בָהּ	מָאָסוּ
20	לבונה משבא תבוא וקנה הַטּוֹב	לבונה משבא תביאו וקִנָּמוֹן
21	הנני נתן אֶל־העם הזה מכשלים	הנני נתן עַל־העם הזה מכשול
	וכשלו בָם	וכשלו
	יֹאבֵדוּ°	יֹאבֵדוּ
22	מֵאֶרֶץ צפון	מִצָּפוֹן[e]
	וגוי גָּדוֹל יעור מִיַּרְכְּתֵי־ארץ	וגוים[f] יעורו[g] מִקְצֵה ארץ
23	ולא ירחמו קוֹלָם כַּיָּם יהמה	וְלֹא ירחם קולו כְּיָם יהמה על־
	וְעַל־סוסים יִרְכָּבוּ עָרוּךְ	סוסים וָרֶכֶב יַעֲרֹךְ כְּאֵשׁ למלחמה
	כְּאִישׁ למלחמה עָלַיִךְ	אֵלַיִךְ
24	אֶת־שָׁמְעוֹ	את־שִׁמְעָם[h]
	חִיל	חֲבָלִים[i]
25	אַל־תֵּצְאִי° הַשָּׂדֶה ובדרך אל־	אל־תצאו בַּשָּׂדֶה (אֶל־השדה)
	תֵּלֵכִי° כי חרב לְאֹיֵב מָגוֹר	ובדרכים אל־תלכו כי חרב
	מסביב	לְאֹיְבִים תָּגוּר מסביב
26	אבל יָחִיד	אבל יָדִיד
	יבא הַשֹּׁדֵד עָלֵינוּ	יבא שד עֲלֵיכֶם
27	נתתיך בעמי מִבְצָר וְתֵדַע	נתתיך בעמי מִבְחָן (מִבְחֹר)
	וּבָחַנְתָּ	וַתֵּדָעֵנִי בְּבָחֳנִי
28	סָרֵי	Deest
	הֹלְכֵי רָכִיל	הלכי מְעֻקָּשִׁים
	כלם מַשְׁחִיתִם	כלם מְשֻׁחָתִים
29	נָחַר מַפֻּחַ מֵאֵשְׁתָּם° עֹפָרֶת	קָחַד (נִכְחַד) מפח מאש תם עפרת

[a] Cf. Job 33: 24. [b] ut Isa. 1: 2. [c] Targ. עַל. [d] Targ. עוֹבָדֵיהוֹן. [e] ut 4: 6; 6: 1; 46: 20; 50: 3, 41.—Targ. מִצִּפּוּנָא. [f] Targ. וְעַמְמִין. [g] Targ. יְיתוּן. [h] Targ. שִׁמְעֲהוֹן. [i] Targ. חֲבָלִין.

	לשוא צרף צֹרֵף ורעִים לא נתקו	לשוא צרף צָרוֹף ורעָתם[a] לא נתכה
30	כסף נמאס קָרְאוּ להם כי מאס יהוה בהם	כסף נמאס קראו להם כי מאס בהם יהוה

CAPUT VII.

1	הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר־הָיָה אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ מֵאֵת יְהוָה לֵאמֹר	Desunt
2	עֲמֹד בְּשַׁעַר בֵּית יְהוָה וְקָרָאתָ שָּׁם אֶת הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה וְאָמַרְתָּ הַבָּאִים בַּשְּׁעָרִים הָאֵלֶּה לְהִשְׁתַּחֲוֹת לַיהוָה	(Desunt)
3	צְבָאוֹת	(Desunt)
4	אל־תבטחו לכם אֶל־דברי השקר	אל־תבטחו לכם עַל־דברי השקר
		כִּי מְאוּמָה לֹא יוֹעִילוּ לָכֶם
	לֵאמֹר	אֹמְרִים[c]
	היכל יהוה היכל יהוה הֵיכַל יְהוָה	היכל יהוה היכל יהוה
5	אם־עשו תעשו	וְעשו תעשו
6	גר יתום	וְגר וְיתום
7	בָּאָרֶץ	בְּאֶרֶץ
8	הִנֵּה	כִּי־אִם
	לְבִלְתִּי הועיל	אֲשֶׁר לֹא יועילו
9	הֲגָנֹב רָצֹחַ וְנָאֹף וְהִשָּׁבֵעַ לשקר וְקַטֵּר לבעל וְהָלֹךְ	וַתִּרְצְחוּ וַתִּנְאֲפוּ וַתִּגְנְבוּ וַתִּשָּׁבְעוּ לשקר וַתְּקַטְּרוּ לבעל וַתֵּלְכוּ[d]
	לא־ידעתם	לא־ידעתם: לְרַע[e] לָכֶם[f]
10	הַזֶּה	Deest
	נִצַּלְנוּ לְמַעַן עשות	כַּאֲצַלנו לְבִלְתִּי עשות
11	הֲמְעָרַת פָּרִצִים הָיָה הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה אשר נקרא שמי־עָלָיו בְּעֵינֵיכֶם גַּם אנכי הנה ראיתי	בֵּיתִי אשר נקרא שמי שָׁם לִפְנֵיכֶם וְהנה אנכי ראיתי

[a] Targ. וְעוֹבָדֵיהוֹן בִּישַׁיָּא. [b] Targ. עַל. [c] Vid. 6:14.—Targ. דְּאָמְרִין. [d] Cf. Exod. 20:13, 14, 15; Deut. 5:17, 18, 19. [e] Inc. vs. 10. [f] ut 7:6; 25:7.

12	כי לכו־נָא	כי לכו
13	נְאֻם־יְהוָה	Deest
	הַשְׁכֵּם וְדַבֵּר ולא שמעתם	ולא שמעתם אֵלַי
14	וְעָשִׂיתִי	לָכֵן גַּם־אני אֶעֱשֶׂה
16	ואל־תִּשָּׂא בעדם רִנָּה וּתְפִלָּה ואל־תפגע־בי כי אֵינֶנִּי שֹׁמֵעַ אֹתָךְ	ואל תְּחַשְּׁבֵם לָחֹן אֹתָם[a](?) וְאַל־תִּתְפַּלֵּל ואל־תפגע־בי בעדם כי לֹא אֶשְׁמָע
18	הַבָּנִים ... וְהָאָבוֹת ... וְהַנָּשִׁים לִמְלֶכֶת השמים וְהַסֵּךְ נסכים	בְּנֵיהֶם ... וַאֲבוֹתֵיהֶם ... וּנְשֵׁיהֶם לִצְבָא השמים בְּהִסָּכוּ נסכים
19	בֹּשֶׁת פניהם	יֵבוֹשׁוּ[b] פניהם
20	אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִה	יְהוָה
	חמתי נתכת אֶל־המקום הזה על־האדם	וחמתי נתכת עַל־המקום הזה וְעַל־האדם
	ועל־עֵץ הַשָּׂדֶה	ועל־כָּל־עֵץ שְׂדֵיהֶם
21	צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	Deest
	סְפוּ עַל־זבחיכם	אִסְפוּ עִם־זבחיכם
22	אֶת־אבותיכם	אֶל־אבותיכם
	ביום הוֹצִיאִי	ביום הַעֲלוֹתִי
	על־דברי עֹלָה	על־דברי עולות[c]
23	בכל־הַדֶּרֶךְ	בכל־דְּרָכַי
24	ולא שמעו ולא־הִטּוּ אֶת־אזנם	ולא שמעו אֵלַי ולא הִקְשִׁיבָה אזנם[d]
	בִּשְׁרִרוּת	Deest
25	אבותיכֶם	אבותיהֶם
	עד היום הזה	וְעַד היום הזה
	השכם וְשָׁלֹחַ	וְהשכם וָאֶשְׁלַח
26	וְלֹא הִטּוּ אֶת־אזנם ויקשו את־עָרְפָּם	לֹא הִקְשִׁיבָה אזנם[e] ויקשו את־צַוָּארָם
	הֵרֵעוּ	Desunt
27	וְדִבַּרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם אֶת־כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה וְלֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ אֵלֶיךָ וְקָרָאתָ אֲלֵיהֶם וְלֹא יַעֲנוּכָה	Desunt

[a] Vid. 11:14. [b] Targ. יִיבְהֲתוּן. [c] Targ. עֲלָוָן. [d] ut Ps. 10:17. [e] ut Ps. 10:17.

28	ואמרת אליהם	ואמרת אליהם אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה
	אשר לוֹא־שָׁמְעוּ	אשר לוא־שָׁמַע
	אֱלֹהָיו	Deest
	ולא לָקְחוּ	ולא לָקַח
	וְנִכְרְתָה	Deest
29	ושאי על־שְׁפָיִם	ושאי על־שְׁפָם
	את־דור עֶבְרָתוֹ	את־הַדור אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה אֵלֶּה[a]
31	ובנו במות התפת	ובנו בָּמַת[b] התפת[c]
	אשר לא צויתי	אשר לא צויתי אֹתָם (צויתִים)
32	ולא־יֵאָמֵר עוד התפת	ולא־יֹאמְרוּ עוד בָּמַת[d] התפת
	גיא ההֲרֵגָה	גיא ההֲרֻגִים[e]
34	קול ששון וקול שִׂמְחָה	קול שָׂשִׂים וקול שְׂמֵחִים
	לחרבה תהיה הארץ	לחרבה תהיה כָּל־הארץ

CAPUT VIII.

1	ויוֹצִיאוּ	יוציאו
	הַנְּבִיאִים	נביאים
	יושבֵי־יְרוּשָׁלִַם	הַיּוֹשְׁבִים בִּירוּשָׁלִַם
2	ולירח	ולירח וּלְכָל־הַכּוֹכָבִים
	ואשר דְּרָשׁוּם	ואשר דָּבְקוּ בָם[f]
	לֹא יֵאָסְפוּ	לא יִסָּפְדוּ[g]
	לְדֹמֶן על־פני האדמה יִהְיוּ	וְהָיוּ לְדִמְיוֹן[h] על־פני האדמה
3	וְנִבְחַר מות מחיים לכל השארית	כִּי בָחֲרוּ בַמּוֹת[i] מחיים[k] וּלכל השארית
	הָרָעָה	Deest
	בכל־הַמְּקֹמוֹת הַנִּשְׁאָרִים	בכל־הַמָּקוֹם
	נְאֻם יְהוָֹה צְבָאוֹת	Deest
4	ואמרת אֲלֵיהֶם כה אמר יהוה	כִּי כה אמר יהוה
	הֲיִפְּלוּ וְלֹא יקומו אִם־יָשׁוּב וְלֹא ישוב	הַנֹּפֵל לא יקום הַשּׁוֹבֵב לא ישוב

---

[a] Aram. עֲבַדוּ=עָבְדוּ. [b] Targ. בָּמַת. [c] Vid. vs. 32. [d] Vid. vs. 31. [e] Targ. קְטִילַיָּא. [f] Cf. Deut. 10:20; 30:20. [g] ut 16:4. [h] Vid. 9:21; 16:4. [i] Targ. וְיִתְרְעוּן בְּמוֹתָא. [k] Cf. Deut. 30:19.

5	הָעָם הזה יְרוּשָׁלַםִ	עַמִּי הזה (זה)
	החזיקו בַּתַּרְמִית	מאנו וְהחזיקו בְּתרמיתָם ומאנו
	לשוב	(וַיְמאנו) לשוב
6	הִקְשַׁבְתִּי וָאֶשְׁמָע	הַקְשִׁיבוּ־נָא וּשְׁמָעוּ
	כֻּלֹּה שָׁב בִּמרצוּתָם	כֻּלָּה נָס (שָׁט[a]) מִמרוצתוֹ
	בַּמִּלְחָמָה	בְּמִצְהֲלָתוֹ (במִצְהָלָה)
7	גם חסידה בשמים ידעה מועדיה	גם־הַחסידה בשמים ידעה מועדה
	וְתור וסוס וְעגור שמרו את־	תור וסיס שָׂדַי[b] עגור שמרו
	עֵת באנה ועמי לא ידעו את	את־עִתּוֹת באֹנָן ועמי הַזֶּה (זה)
	משפט יהוה	לא ידעו את משפטי יהוה
8	חכמים אנחנו	כִּי חכמים אנחנו
	אָכֵן הִנֵּה	Deest
	לשקר עָשָׂה עט שקר ספרים	לשקר הָיָה עט שקר לְספרים
9	חתו וילכדו הִנֵּה בִדְבַר־יהוה	וְחתו וילכדו כִּי תוֹרַת יהוה מאסו[c]
	מאסו וחכמת־מה לָהם	וחכמת־מה בָּהם[d]
10	שדותיהם	ושדותיהם
	כִּי מִקָּטֹן וְעַד־גָּדוֹל כֻּלֹּה בֹּצֵעַ	Desunt
	בָּצַע מִנָּבִיא וְעַד־כֹּהֵן כֻּלֹּה	
11	עֹשֶׂה שָּׁקֶר: וַיְרַפּוּ אֶת־שֶׁבֶר	
	בַּת־עַמִּי עַל־נְקַלָּה לֵאמֹר שָׁלוֹם	
12	שָׁלוֹם וְאֵין שָׁלוֹם: הֹבִשׁוּ כִּי	
	תוֹעֵבָה עָשׂוּ גַּם־בּוֹשׁ לֹא־	
	יֵבֹשׁוּ וְהִכָּלֵם לֹא יָדָעוּ לָכֵן	
	יִפְּלוּ בַנֹּפְלִים בְּעֵת פְּקֻדָּתָם	
	יִכָּשְׁלוּ אָמַר יְהוָֹה:	
13	אָסֹף אסיפם	וְאָסְפוּ אסיפָם
	אין עֲנָבִים בַּגֶּפֶן ואין תאנים	אין עֵנָב בַּכְּרָמִים ואין תאנים
	בתאנָה והעָלֶה נובל	בתאנִים והעלִים נובְלִים (נָבְלוּ)
	וָאֶתֵּן לָהֶם יַעַבְרוּם	Deest
14	וְנִדְּמָה־שם כי יְהוָֹה אלהינו	וְנֵרָמֶה־שם כי הָאלהים הִשְׁלִיכָנוּ
	הֲדִמָּנוּ	(הִרְמָנוּ)
	כי חטאנו לַיהוָֹה	כי חטאנו לו

[a] Aram. שְׁטַף. [b] Cf. Ps. 50:11. [c] ut Amos 2:4. [d] Cf. I. Kings 3:28.

15	קַוֵּה לשלום	קִוִּינוּ[a] לשלום
	והנה בְעָתָה	והנה בֶהָלָה[b]
16	נִחֲרת סוסיו מקול מצהלות אַבִּירָיו	קול דַּהֲרת (נַהֲרַת?) סוסיו מקול מצהלַת רֶכֶב סוּסָיו (אַבִּירָיו)
	וַיָּבוֹאוּ וַיֹּאכְלוּ	וְיָבוֹא וְיֹאכַל
17	נחשים צִפְעֹנִים	נחשים מְמִיתִים
	נְאֻם־יְהוָה	Deest
18	מַבְלִיגִיתִי עלי יגון עָלַי לִבִּי דוי	מבליגית (מִבְּלִי־גֵהָה?) עלי יגון לִבְּכֶם דוי
19	מארץ מַרְחַקִּים	מארץ מֶרְחָק[c]
	אם־מַלְכָּהּ אין בָּהּ מַדּוּעַ הכעסוני	אם־מֶלֶךְ[d] אין שָׁם כִּי הכעסוני
	בהבלי נכר	ובהבלי נכר
20	עבר קציר כלה קיץ	עבר קיץ כלה קציר
21	הָשְׁבַּרְתִּי	Deest
	שמה החזקתני	בְּשמה החזקתני צִירִים (חֲבָלִים) כַּיּוֹלֵדָה[e]
22	הצרי אין בגלעד	וְהצרי אין בגלעד
	כִּי מדוע	מדוע
23	מי־יתן ראשי מים וְעֵינִי מקור דִּמְעָה ואבכה	מי־יתן[f] לְראשי מים וּלְעֵינַי[g] מקור דְּמָעוֹת ואבכה אֶת־עַמִּי הַזֶּה[h]

CAPUT IX.

1	מלון אֹרְחִים	מלון אַחֲרוֹן (רָחוֹק)
2	וידרכו את־לשונם קַשְׁתָּם שקר ולא לֶאמונה גברו בָאָרֶץ	וידרכו את־לשונם כְּקֶשֶׁת[i] שקר ולא אמונה גברה (גָּבַר) עַל־הָאָרֶץ
	נְאֻם־יהוה	אָמַר יהוה
3	ועל־כָּל־אָח	ועל־אֲחֵיהֶם
4	יהתלו וֶאמת לא ידברו לִמְּדוּ לשונם	יהתל אמת לא ידברו לָמְדָה לשונם

[a] Vid. 14: 19.—Targ. סַבַּרְנָא. [b] Cf. 15: 8. [c] Targ. רְחִיקָא. [d] Targ. מַלְכָּא. [e] Cf. 49: 24. [f] Inc. cap. IX. [g] Targ. וְעֵינַי. [h] Cf. II. Chron. 1: 10. [i] Targ. כְּנִשְׁתָּא.

	הַעֲוֵה נלאו׃	הָעֲוֵו[a] וְלֹא נלאו שֹׁב (שׁוּב)׃
5	שִׁבְתְּךָ בתוך מִרְמָה במרמה	תֹּךְ[b] בתוך מרמה במרמה
	נְאֻם־יהוה	אָמַר יהוה
6	צְבָאוֹת	Deest
	כִּי־אֵיךְ אעשה מפני בת־עמי	כי אעשה מפני רָעַת[c] בת־עמי
7	חץ שָׁוֹחֵט לשונם מִרְמָה דִּבֵּר	חץ שׁוֹחֵט[d] לשונם מרמות[e] דִּבְרֵי
	בְּפִיו שלום את־רעהו ידבר	פִיהֶם[f] את־רעהו ידבר שלום
	ובקרבו ישים אָרְבּוֹ	ובקרבו ישים הָאֵיבָה (יֵשׁ אֵיבָתוֹ)
8	לא־אפקד־בָּם	לא־אפקד[g]
9	אֶשָּׂא בְכִי וָנהי	שְׂאוּ נהי
	כִּי נִצְּתוּ מבלי־איש עֹבֵר וְלֹא שמעו	כי נִתְּצוּ (כָּלוּ) מבלי־איש לא שמעו
10	לְגַלִּים מעון תנים	לגלים (לְגָלוּת) וְלִמְעוֹן תנים
11	מִי־האיש הֶחָכָם	מי־האיש הַנָּבוֹן
	דִּבֶּר פי־יהוה אליו וְיַגִּדָהּ	דְּבַר פי־יהוה אליו יַגֵּד לָכֶם (ויַגִּדְכֶם)
	מבלי עבר	מבלי עבר בָּהּ
12	ויאמר יהוה	ויאמר יהוה אֵלַי
	וְלֹא־הָלְכוּ בָהּ	Deest
13	שְׁרִרוּת לבם	תַּאֲוַת לבם הָרָע[h]
14	צְבָאוֹת	Deest
	מאכילם אֶת־הָעָם הַזֶּה לַעֲנָה	מאכילם עֳנִי (עָקָה[i])
15	ושלחתי אַחֲרֵיהֶם את־החרב	ושלחתי עֲלֵיהֶם את־החרב עד
	עד כַּלּוֹתִי אוֹתָם	כְּלוֹתָם בָּהּ
16	כה אמר יהוה צְבָאוֹת הִתְבּוֹנְנוּ	כה אמר יהוה קראו
	וְקִראו	
	וּתְבוֹאֶנָה	וַתַּבַּעְנָה[k] (וְתַעֲנֶינָה)
17	וּתְמַהֵרְנָה ותשנה עָלֵינוּ נֶהִי	ותשאנה עֲלֵיכֶם קִינָה ותרדנה
	ותרדנה עינינו דִּמְעָה	עיניכם דְּמָעוֹת[l] ועפעפיכֶם יזלו־
	ועפעפינו יזלו־מים	מים
18	נשמע מִצִּיּוֹן	נשמע בְּצִיּוֹן

[a] Targ. אִיתְּעַשְׁתּוּ. [b] Cf. Ps. 55:12.—Inc. vs. 5. [c] Targ. . . . בִּן־קֳדָם חוֹבֵי. —Cf. Hos. 10:15. [d] Targ. כְּגִיר דִּי מְחָרֵה. [e] Targ. נִכְלִין. [f] Targ. בְּפוּמְהוֹן. [g] ut 5:9, 29. [h] ut 7:24. [i] Vid. 23:15.—Targ. עָקָא. [k] ut Ps. 119:171. [l] Targ. דִּמְעִין.

	כי־עזבנו ארץ כִּי השְׁלִיכוּ משכנותינו	כי־עזבנו הָארץ וְהִשְׁלַכְנוּ משכנותינו
19	כִּי־שמענה נשים דבר־יהוה ותקח אזנְכם דְּבַר־פִּיו	שמענה נשים דבר־יהוה ותקח אזְנֵיכם[a] דִּבְרֵי[b]־פיו
20	כי־עלה מות בחלונינוּ בא בארמנותינוּ להכרית עֹלָל מחוץ בחורים מרחבות	כי־עלה מות בחלוניכֶם בא באדמתכֶם להכרית עוֹלְלִים[c] מחוץ וּבחורים מרחבות
21	דַּבֵּר כֹּה נְאֻם־יְהֹוָה	Deest
	וְנָפְלָה נבלַת האָדָם כְּדֹמֶן על־ פני הַשָּׂדֶה וּכְעָמִיר	וְהָיוּ נבלֹת האֲנָשִׁים לְדִמְיוֹן[d] על־פני שְׂדֵה אַרְצְכֶם (אַדְמַתְכֶם) כְּחָצִיר (כְּעֵשֶׂב)
22	אל־יתהלל עשיר	וְאל־יתהלל עשיר
23	השכל וידוע אוֹתִי	השכל וידוע
	עשה חסד משפט וצדקה בָּארץ כי־באלה חָפַצְתִּי	עשה חסד וּמשפט וצדקה עַל־הָארץ כי־באלה חֶפְצִי
24	על־כל־מול בְּערלה	על־כל־מוּלֵי ערלָתָם
25	ועל־יְהוּדָה	ועל־אֲדוֹמִים[e]
	ועל־מואב ועל כל־קצוצֵי פאה עֲרֵלִים ערלי־לֵב	ועל־בְּנֵי מואב[f] ועל כל־קצוץ הַפאה עַרְלֵי־בָשָׂר[g] ערלי־לְבָבָם (הַלֵּב).

CAPUT X.

1	הַדָּבָר אשר דבר יהוה	דְּבַר יהוה אשר דבר
2	אל־דֶּרֶךְ הגוים כי־יחתו הַגּוֹיִם מֵהמה	אל־דַּרְכֵי הגוים כי־יחתו המה מִפְּנֵיהֶם (לִפְנֵיהֶם)
3	כִּי־עץ מיער כְּרָתוֹ מעשה	עץ הוּא מיער כֹּרֵת מעשה חרש
4	יְדֵי־חרש בַּמַּעֲצָד: בכסף ובזהב יְיַפֵּהוּ במסמרות ובמקבות יחזקום ולוא יפיק	וּמְצָק (וּמַסֵּכָה): בכסף ובזהב מְיֻפִּים (יְיַפּוּ) במקבות ובמסמרות יחזקום: יַצִּיגוּם[h] ולוא יפיקוּ (יִמּוֹטוּ[i])

[a] Targ. אוּדְנֵיכוֹן [b] Targ. לְמִלֵּי. [c] Targ. יָנְקִין. [d] Vid. 8:2; 16:4. [e] Targ. אֲדוֹמָאֵי. [f] Targ. מוֹאֲבָאֵי. [g] Targ. עַרְלִין בִּבְשַׂרְהוֹן. [h] Inc. vs. 5. [i] Cf. Isa. 41:7.

5	כְּתֹמֶר מִקְשָׁה הֵמָּה וְלֹא יְדַבֵּרוּ אַל־תִּירְאוּ מֵהֶם וְגַם־הֵיטֵיב אֵין אוֹתָם	Deest אַל־תִּירְאוּ אוֹתָם וְטוֹב אֵין בָּהֶם
6	מֵאֵין כָּמוֹךָ יְהוָה גָּדוֹל אַתָּה	Desunt
7	וְגָדוֹל שִׁמְךָ בִּגְבוּרָה: מִי לֹא יִרָאֲךָ מֶלֶךְ הַגּוֹיִם כִּי לְךָ יָאָתָה כִּי בְכָל־חַכְמֵי הַגּוֹיִם וּבְכָל־מַלְכוּתָם מֵאֵין כָּמוֹךָ:	Desunt
8	וּבְאַחַת יִבְעֲרוּ וְיִכְסָלוּ מוּסַר הֲבָלִים עֵץ הוּא:	Desunt
9	כסף מרקע מתרשיש יוּבָא וְזהב מֵאופז מעשה חָרָשׁ וִידֵי צורף תכלת וארגמן לבושם מעשה חֲכָמִים כלם	כֶּסֶף מְקֻשֶּׁה הוּא לֹא יְהַלֵּכוּ כסף מרקע הוּא מתרשיש יָבוֹא זהב מְאופז (מוּפָז[a]) וְיַד צוֹרְפִים מעשי חָרָשִׁים כלם תכלת וארגמן לבושם.
10	וַיהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֱמֶת הוּא־אֱלֹהִים חַיִּים וּמֶלֶךְ עוֹלָם מִקִּצְפּוֹ תִּרְעַשׁ הָאָרֶץ וְלֹא־יָכִלוּ גוֹיִם זַעְמוֹ	Desunt
12	עשה אֶרֶץ בכחו מכין תבל בחכמתו ובתבונתו נטה שמים	יְהוָה הָעֹשֶׂה הָאָרֶץ בכחו[b] הַמֵּכִין תבל בחכמתו ובתבונתו נטה הַשמים
13	לְקוֹל תִּתּוֹ המון מים מקצה ° ארץ ויוצא רוּחַ	וַהמון מים מקצה הָארץ ויוצא אוֹר[c]
14	הביש כל־צורף מִפָּסֶל כי שקר נִסְכּוֹ וְלא־רוח בם	הביש כל־צורף עַל־פְּסִילָיו כי שקר נָסֶךְ לא־רוח בם
15	הֶבֶל המה מעשה תַּעְתֻּעִים	הֲבָלִים המה מעשי מְתַעְתְּעִים (מִתַּעְתְּעִים)
16	וְיִשְׂרָאֵל שֵׁבֶט צְבָאוֹת	Desunt

[a] *Μωφάζ*. [b] Cf. 51:15. [c] Vid. 51:16.

17	אִסְפִּי מֵאֶרֶץ כנעתך יוֹשֶׁבֶתי° בַּמָּצוֹר	אָסַף מִחוּץ כנעתך (קִנְיָנֵךְ) יוֹשְׁבִים בְּמִבְחָר
18	הִנְנִי קוֹלֵעַ	הִנְנִי צוֹלֵעַ (מַצְלִיעַ[a])
	בַּפַּעַם	Deest
	וַהֲצֵרוֹתִי לָהֶם	בְּצָרָה
	לְמַעַן יִמְצָאוּ	לְמַעַן תִּמָּצֵא מַכָּתֵךְ[b]
19	אוֹי־לִי עַל־שִׁבְרִי נַחְלָה מַכָּתִי	אוֹי עַל־שִׁבְרֵךְ נַחְלָה מַכָּתֵךְ
	אַךְ זֶה חֳלִי וְאֶשָּׂאֶנּוּ	אַךְ זֶה חָלְיֵךְ וַיִּשָּׂאֵךְ
20	אָהֳלִי שֻׁדָּד וְכָל־מֵיתָרַי נִתָּקוּ בָּנַי יְצָאֻנִי וְאֵינָם אֵין נֹטֶה עוֹד אָהֳלִי וּמֵקִים יְרִיעוֹתָי	אָהֳלֵךְ שֻׁדָּד אָבַד וְכָל־יְרִיעוֹתַיִךְ נִתָּקוּ בָּנַי וְצֹאנִי אֵינָם אֵין עוֹד מְקוֹם (נְוֵה) אָהֳלִי מְקוֹם יְרִיעוֹתָי
21	כִּי נִבְעֲרוּ הָרֹעִים	כִּי הָרֹעִים נִבְעָרוּ
	לֹא הִשְׂכִּילוּ וְכָל־מַרְעִיתָם נְפוֹצָה	לֹא הִשְׂכִּילָה כָּל־הַמַּרְעִית וְנָפוֹצוּ
22	שְׁמָמָה מְעוֹן תַּנִּים	לִשְׁמָמָה° וּמְעוֹן יְעֵנִים
23	לֹא־לְאִישׁ הֹלֵךְ וְהָכִין	וְלֹא־אִישׁ יֵלֵךְ וְיָכִין
24	יַסְּרֵנִי יהוה	יַסְּרֵנוּ יהוה
	אַל־בְּאַפְּךָ פֶּן־תַּמְעִטֵנִי	וְאַל־בְּאַף פֶּן־תַּמְעִטֵנוּ
25	וַאֲכָלֻהוּ[d]	Deest

CAPUT XI.

1	אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ מֵאֵת יהוה	מֵאֵת יהוה אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ
2	וְדִבַּרְתָּם אֶל־אִישׁ יְהוּדָה וְעַל־יֹשְׁבֵי יְרוּשָׁלִָם	וְדִבַּרְתָּ אֶל־אַנְשֵׁי יְהוּדָה וְאֶל־הַיֹּשְׁבִים בִּירוּשָׁלִָם°
4	הוֹצִיאִי־אוֹתָם	הֶעֱלוֹתִי (אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱלֵיתִי) אוֹתָם
	וַעֲשִׂיתֶם אוֹתָם כְּכֹל	וַעֲשִׂיתֶם כֹּל
5	הָקִים אֶת־הַשְּׁבוּעָה	אָקִים שְׁבוּעָתִי
6	אֶת־כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה	אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה
	וּבְחֻצוֹת יְרוּשָׁלִָם	וּמִחוּץ לִירוּשָׁלִָם
7	כִּי הָעֵד הַעִדֹתִי בַּאֲבוֹתֵיכֶם בְּיוֹם הַעֲלוֹתִי אוֹתָם מֵאֶרֶץ	Desunt

[a] σκελίζω. [b] Targ. פּוּרְעָנוּת חוֹבֵיהוֹן. [c] Targ. לְצָרוּ. [d] Cf. Ps. 79:7.
[e] Vid. vs. 9; 4:3.

	מִצְרַיִם עַד־הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה הַשְׁכֵּם	Desunt
	וְהָעֵד לֵאמֹר שִׁמְעוּ בְּקוֹלִי׃	
8	וְלֹא שָׁמְעוּ וְלֹא־הִטּוּ אֶת־אָזְנָם	
	וַיֵּלְכוּ אִישׁ בִּשְׁרִירוּת לִבָּם	
	הָרָע וָאָבִיא עֲלֵיהֶם אֶת־כָּל־	
	דִּבְרֵי הַבְּרִית־הַזֹּאת אֲשֶׁר־	
	צִוִּיתִי לַעֲשׂוֹת	
9	בְּאִישׁ יהודה וּבְיֹשְׁבֵי יְרוּשָׁלִַם	בַּאַנְשֵׁי יהודה וּבַיֹּשְׁבִים בִּירוּשָׁלִַם[a]
10	והמה הָלְכוּ	וְהִנֵּה המה הֹלְכִים
	הפרו	וְהפרו (וַיָּפֵרוּ)
	אשר כָּרַתִּי אֶת־אבותם	אשר נָתַתִּי לַאבותם
11	הנני מביא אֲלֵיהֶם רָעָה	הנני מביא עַל[b]־הָעָם הַזֶּה רָעוֹת[c]
12	וְהוֹשֵׁעַ לֹא־יוֹשִׁיעוּ	אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יוֹשִׁיעוּ
13	מִזְבְּחוֹת לַבֹּשֶׁת	Deest
14	ואל־תִּשָּׂא בעדם רִנָּה	ואל־תִּתְחַשְּׁבֵם [לָבוֹא] בעדם בִּתְחִנָּה
	ותפלה	וּבִתפלה[d]
	בְּעַד רעתם	בְּעֵת רעתם[e]
15	מֶה לִידִידִי בְּבֵיתִי עֲשׂוֹתָהּ	לָמָּה הַיְדִידָה (יְדִידָתִי) בביתי
	הַמְזִמָּתָה הָרַבִּים וּבְשַׂר־קֹדֶשׁ	עָשְׂתָה (מ)זמתה הָרָנִים (הָרְנָנִים,
	יַעַבְרוּ מעליך כִּי רָעָתֵכִי אָז	הַנְּדָרִים) ובשר־קדש יַעֲבִרוּ מעליך
	תַּעֲלֹזִי	רָעָתֵיכִי אוֹ (אִם) תֶּחָלְצִי בָּהֶם
16	זית רענן יְפֵה פְרִי־תֹאַר	זית יָפֶה רענן בְּתֹאַר
	לקול הֲמוּלָּה גדלה הִצִּית אש	לקול הַמּוּלָה הוּצַּת אש עליה
	עליה וְרָעוּ דליותיו	גדלה הַצָּרָה עָלַיִךְ[f] רעו דליותֶיהָ
17	צְבָאוֹת	Deest
	אֲשֶׁר עשו להם	כִּי עשו להם
	לְקַטֵּר לבעל	בְּקַטְּרָם לבעל
18	וַיהוה הוֹדִיעַנִי	יהוה הוֹדִיעֵנִי
	הִרְאִיתַנִי	רָאִיתִי (אֶרְאֶה)
19	ככבש אַלּוּף	ככבש תָּמִים
	וְלֹא ידעתי כִּי־עלי חשבו	לא ידעתי עלי חשבו מחשבה רָעָה[g]
	מחשבות נַשְׁחִיתָה	לֵאמֹר לְכוּ וְנַשְׁחִיתָה (וְנַשְׁלִיכָה[h])

---

[a] Vid. vs. 2; 4:3. [b] Targ. עֲלֵיכוֹן. [c] Cf. 3:5. [d] Vid. 7:16. [e] Targ. בְּעִדָּן בִּישְׁתְּהוֹן. [f] Targ. עֲלָךְ. [g] Targ. עֶשְׁתּוֹנִין בִּישִׁין. [h] Targ. נִרְמֵי.

20	וַיהוה צְבָאוֹת שֹׁפֵט צֶדֶק וָלֵב	יהוה שֹׁפֵט צְדָקוֹת וְלִבּוֹת (וּלְבָבוֹת)
21	הַמְבַקְשִׁים אֶת־נַפְשְׁךָ לֵאמֹר בְּשֵׁם יהוה וְלֹא תָמוּת בְּיָדֵנוּ	הַמְבַקְשִׁים אֶת־נַפְשִׁי הָאֹמְרִים[a] עַל־שֵׁם יהוה וָלֹא (וְאִם־לֹא[b]) תָּמוּת בְּיָדֵינוּ
22	לָכֵן כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָֹה צְבָאוֹת הִנְנִי פֹּקֵד עֲלֵיהֶם הַבַּחוּרִים יָמֻתוּ בַחֶרֶב בְּנֵיהֶם וּבְנוֹתֵיהֶם יָמֻתוּ בָּרָעָב	הִנֵּה אֶפְקֹד עֲלֵיהֶם בַּחוּרֵיהֶם[c] בַּחֶרֶב יָמוּתוּ וּבְנֵיהֶם וּבְנוֹתֵיהֶם יִתַּמּוּ בָּרָעָב[d]
23	אֶל־אַנְשֵׁי עֲנָתוֹת שְׁנַת פְּקֻדָּתָם	עַל־הַיּוֹשְׁבִים בַּעֲנָתוֹת בִּשְׁנַת[e] פְּקֻדָּתָם

CAPUT XII.

2	יָלְכוּ	יָלְדוּ
3	תִּרְאֵנִי וּבָחַנְתָּ לִבִּי אִתָּךְ הַתִּקֵם כְּצֹאן לְטִבְחָה וְהַקְדִּשֵׁם לְיוֹם הֲרֵגָה	וּבָחַנְתָּ לִבִּי אִתָּךְ הַקְדִּשֵׁם לְיוֹם הֲרֵגָתָם (הַהֲרֵגָה[f])
4	וְעֵשֶׂב כָּל־הַשָּׂדֶה לֹא יִרְאֶה אֶת־אַחֲרִיתֵנוּ	וְכָל־עֵשֶׂב הַשָּׂדֶה לֹא יִרְאֶה הָאֱלֹהִים אֶת־אָרְחֹתֵינוּ
5	כִּי אֶת־רַגְלִים רַצְתָּה וַיַּלְאוּךָ וְאֵיךְ תְּתַחֲרֶה וּבְאֶרֶץ שָׁלוֹם וְאֵיךְ תַּעֲשֶׂה	אַתָּה רַגְלֶיךָ יָרוּצוּ וַיַּלְאוּךָ וְאֵיךְ תִּתְעָרֵךְ וּבְאֶרֶץ שְׁלוֹמְךָ (הַשָּׁלוֹם) אֵיךְ תַּעֲשֶׂה
6	קָרְאוּ אַחֲרֶיךָ מָלֵא	קָרְאוּ מֵאַחֲרֶיךָ מָלְאוּ (הִתְמַלָּאוּ)
8	נָתְנָה עָלַי בְּקוֹלָהּ	נָתְנָה עָלַי קוֹלָהּ[g]
9	הַעַיִט צָבוּעַ הַעַיִט סָבִיב עָלֶיהָ כָּל־חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה הֵתָיוּ לְאָכְלָה	הַמְּעָרַת צָבוּעַ הַמְּעָרָה מִסָּבִיב לָהּ כָּל־חַיּוֹת הַשָּׂדֶה וְיֶאֱתָיוּ לְאָכְלָהּ[h]
11	שָׂמָהּ לִשְׁמָמָה אָבְלָה עָלַי שְׁמֵמָה	שָׂמָה (הוּשָׂמָה) לִשְׁמָמָה אָבְדָה (אָבֵדָה) עָלַי שְׁמֵמָה

---

[a] Targ. דְּאָמְרִין. [b] Cf. I. Sam. 2: 16. [c] Targ. עוּלֵימֵיהוֹן. [d] ut 14: 15; 44: 12. [e] Vid. 23: 12. [f] ut 7: 32; 19: 6. [g] Targ. אִתְרְגוּשְׁתַּהּ. [h] Targ. לְמִבְזַּהּ.

12	מקצה אֶרץ וְעד־קצה הארץ	מקצה הָאָרץ עד־קצה הארץ
13	זָרעו חטים וקצים קָצָרו נֶחֱלו	זִרעו חטים וקצים קִצְרו נַחֲלוֹתֵיהֶם
	לא יועלו ובשו מִתְּבוּאֹתֵיכם	לא יועלו לָהֶם בשו מִתִּפְאַרְתְּכם
	מֵחֲרוֹן אַף־יהוה	מֵחָרֵף לִפְנֵי יהוה
14	כה אמר יהוה	כִּי כה אמר יהוה
	שכֵנַי	הַשכֵנִים[a]
	הנגעים בַּנחלה	הנגעים בְּנַחלָתִי
	ואת־בֵּית יהודה	ואת־יהודה
15	וַהֲשִׁיבתים	וְהוֹשַׁבתים (וְהוֹשַׁבְתִּים)
16	את־דַּרְכֵי עמי	את־דֶּרֶךְ[b] עמי
	ונבנו	ונבנָה
17	ואם לא יִשְׁמָעו	ואם לא יָשׁובו
	נְאֻם־יְהוָה	Deest

CAPUT XIII.

1	אֵלַי	Deest
	ובמים לא תְבִאֵהו	ובמים לא יָבוֹא
3	שֵׁנִית	Desunt
4	אֲשֶׁר קָנִיתָ	
	לך פרתה	וְלך פרתה
5	כאשר צוה יהוה אותי	כאשר צוה אותי יהוה
6	לְטָמְנוֹ־שם	לְטָמְנוֹ־שם
7	ואלך פרתה	ואלך פרתה הַזָּהָר
	והנה נשחת הָאֵזוֹר לא יצלח לכל	והנה נשחת אֲשֶׁר לא־יצלח לכל[c]
9	ואת־גאון ירושלם הָרָב:	ואת־גאון ירושלם:
10	הָעָם הזה הָרָע	הרב[d] הַגָּאוֹן הזה
	ההלכים בִּשְׁרִרוּת לִבָּם וַיֵּלְכוּ	וְהלכים אחרי אלהים
	אחרי אלהים אחרים.	אחרים
	וִיהִי	וְהָיוּ[e]
11	אֶל־מתני איש	עַל־מתני איש

[a] Targ. מְגֵירַיָּא. [b] Targ. כְּאֹרְחַת. [c] ut vs. 10. [d] Inc. vs. 10. [e] Targ. וִיהוֹן.

	את־כָּל־בית ישראל	את־בית ישראל
	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	Deest
	לְעם וּלְשם ולתהלה ולתפארת ולא שָׁמֵעו	לעם שם ולתפאֶרת ולתהלה ולא שִׁמְעו אֵלָי
12	ואמרת אֲלֵיהֶם	ואמרת אֶל־הָעָם הַזֶּה
	אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָֹה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	Desunt
	בְּאָמרו אליך	וְהָיָה כִּי־יֹאמרו[a] אליך
13	את־כָּל־ישבי הארץ	את־ישבי הארץ
	ואת־הַמְּלָכִים הישבים לדוד על־כסאו	ואת־מַלְכֵיהֶם הישבים בָּנִים לדוד על־כסאותָם[b]
	ואת־הנביאים ואת כל־ישבי יְרושלם שִׁכָּרוֹן	ואת־הנביאים וְאֶת־יְהוּדָה ואת כל־הַיּשבִים בִּירושלם שֵׁכָר
14	וְנִפַּצְתִּים איש אֶל־אחיו וְהָאָבות וְהַבָּנִים יַחְדָּו נְאֻם־יהוה לא־אחמול	וַהֲפִיצוֹתִים איש וְאחיו וַאֲבוֹתֵיהֶם וּבְנֵיהֶם יַחַד לא־אחמוֹד אָמַר יהוה (נאֻם־יהוה)
15	אל־תגבהו	וְאל־תגבהו
16	וְשָׂמָהּ לְצלמות יָשִׁית לערפל	וְשָׁמָּה צלמות[c] וְשָׁתוּ לערפל
17	ואם לא תשמעוּהָ	ואם לא תשמעו
	תבכה נפשִׁי	תבכה נַפְשְׁכֶם
	וְדָמֹעַ תִּדְמַע	Deest
	ותרד עֵינִי דִּמְעָה כי נִשְׁבָּה עדר יהוה	ותרדְנָה עֵינֵיכֶם דְּמָעוֹת[d] כי נִשְׁבַּר עדר יהוה
18	אמר למלך ולגבירָה השפילו שבו כי יָרַד מַרְאֲשׁוֹתֵיכם	אמר למלך ולגבירִים (וְלַגִּבּוֹרִים) השפילו וְשבו כי הוּרד מֵרֹאשְׁכֶם
19	כֻּלָּהּ הָגְלָת שלומים	כָּלָה הַגָּלֻת שלומים
20	שְׂאִי עֵינֵיכֶם וראי	שְׂאִי עֵינַיִךְ יְרוּשָׁלַיִם וראי
21	כי־יפקֹד עליך	כי־יפקְדוּ עליך
22	נחמסו עקביך	נחשְׂפו (נִכְמְסוּ, נִרְאוּ, הָדְמוּ[e]) עקביך
23	לְמֻדֵי הָרֵעַ	למדִים הָרָע (הָרָעוֹת)
24	כקש עובר לְרוח מדבר	כקש עובר מֵרוח לְמדבר[f]

---

[a] ut 15:2; Exod. 12:26. [b] Cf. Ps. 122:5. [c] Targ. ... וִיהֵי חֲשׁוֹךְ. [d] Targ. דִּמְעִין. [e] παραδειγματισθῆναι.—Targ. אִתְּחֲזִי. [f] Targ. כְּקַשָּׁא דְּדָרֵי מִן קֳדָם רוּחָא לְמַדְבְּרָא.

25	מנת־מִדַּיִךְ מֵאִתִּי	ומנת־מָרְיְכֶם אִתִּי
27	נאפַיִךְ ומצהלוֹתַיִךְ זִמַּת זנותך	וְנאפַךְ ומצהלָתֵךְ[a] וְזָרַת[b] (וְנֵכֶר)
	על־גבעות בשדה	זנותך על־הַגּבעות וּבַשּׂדוֹת
	לא תטהרי אחרֵי מתי עד	כי לא תטהרי אחרֵי עַד־מתי עד

CAPUT XIV.

1	אֲשֶׁר הָיָה דבר־יהוה	וַיְהִי דבר־יהוה
	על־דִּבְרֵי הבצרוֹת	על־הבצֹּרֶת (הבצֹּרֶת[c])
2	קדרו לָארץ	וְקדרו עַל־הָארץ
3	ואדירֵיהֶם	ואדירֶיהָ
	לא־מצאו מים	וְלא־מצאו מים[d]
	שבו	וְשבו
	בֹּשׁוּ וְהָכְלְמוּ וְחָפוּ רֹאשָׁם	Deest
4	בַּעֲבוּר האדמה חתה	וַעֲבוֹד[e](ת) האדמה חָדֵל
	בָּאָרֶץ	Deest
5	כִּי גם־אַיֶּלֶת בשדה ילדָה ועזוב	גם־אַיָּלוֹת בשדה ילדוּ ועָזְבוּ
6	וּפראים	פראים
	שאפו רוח כַּתַּנִּים	וְשאפו רוח
	כי־אֵין עשב	כי־לא הָיָה[f] עשב
7	אִם־עונינו עָנו בנו יהוה עשה	עונינו קָמו בנו יהוה עשה לָנוּ
	לְמַעַן שְׁמֶךָ כי־רבו מְשׁוּבֹתֵינוּ	לְמַעַנְךָ כי־רבו עֲוֹנֵינוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
	לך חטאנו	(לְנֶגְדֶּךָ) כִּי לך חטאנו
8	מקוה ישראל מוֹשִׁיעוֹ בעת צָרָה	מקוה ישראל יְהוָה[g] וְתוֹשִׁיעַ בעת
	למה תהיה כגר בָּארץ וכאֹרֵחַ	רָעָה[h] למה תהיה כגר עַל־הָארץ
	נָטָה לָלוּן	וכאֶזְרָח נֹטֶה לְמָלוֹן[i]
9	כאיש נִדְהָם כְּגִבּוֹר	כאיש נִרְדָּם אוֹ כְגֶבֶר (וּכְגֶבֶר)
	ואתה בְקִרְבֵּנוּ	ואתה בָּנוּ
	ושמך עלינו נקרא אל־תַּנִּחֵנוּ	ושמך נקרא אל־תִּשְׁכָּחֵנוּ

---

[a] Targ. בְּאוֹשָׁתִיךְ וּשְׁטוּתִיךְ. [b] ἀπαλλοτρίωσις. [c] Cf. 17:8. [d] Targ. וְלָא אַשְׁכָּחוּ מַיָּא. [e] Aram. וְעָבֵיד. [f] ut vs. 5.—Targ. לָא הֲווֹ. [g] ut 17:13. [h] Cf. 15:11. [i] Targ. דְּסָטֵא לִמְבָתָא.

10	כֵּן אהבו לנוע רגליהם לא חשכו	אהבו לָנִיעַ (= לְהָנִיעַ) רגליהם וְלֹא חשכו הָאֱלֹהִים לֹא יְאַשְּׁרֵם[a]
	וַיהוָֹה לֹא רָצָם	
	וְיִפְקֹד חַטֹּאתָם	Deest
12	כי יצמו	כי אִם יצמו
	אֶל־רִנָּתָם	אֶל־תְּפִלָּתָם[b]
	אנכי מְכַלֶּה אותם ·	אנכי אֲכַלֶּה אותם
13	אֲהָהּ אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה	אַתָּה יְהוָֹה[c]
	הַנְּבִיאִים אמרים לָהֶם	נְבִיאֵיהֶם מִתְנַבְּאִים[d] וְאמרים
	ורעב לא־יהיה לָכֶם כי שְׁלוֹם אמת אתן לָכֶם בַּמקום הזה	ורעב לא־יהיה בָכֶם כי אמת וְשָׁלוֹם[e] אתן עַל־הָאָרֶץ וּבמקום הזה
14	חֲזוֹן שקר וְקֶסֶם וֶאֱלִוֹל ותרמוֹת לבם	כִּי חֶזְיוֹנוֹת שקר וּקְסָמִים וְנַחַשׁ ותדמית[f] לבם
15	הנבאים בשמי	הנבאים בשמי שֶׁקֶר
	וְהֵמָּה אמרים	הָאמרים
	לא יהיה בָּארץ הזאת	לא יהיה עַל־הָארץ הזאת
	בַּחֶרֶב	מְמוֹתֵי תַחֲלֻאִים יָמֻתוּ[g] (בְּמוֹת חֳלִי)
	הנביאים הָהֵמָּה	הנביאים
16	יהיו משלכים	וְיהיו משלכים
	מפני הרעב והחרב ואין מקבר לָהֵמָּה הֵמָּה נשיהם	מפני החרב והרעב[h] ואין מקבר אוֹתָם וּנשיהם
17	תֵּרַדְנָה עֵינַי דִּמְעָה לַילה ויומם	הוֹרִידוּ על־עֵינֵיכֶם דְּמָעוֹת יומם וָלָילה
	כי שבר גָּדוֹל נשברה בְּתוּלַת בת־עמי מכה נחלה מאד	כִּי שבר נשברה בת־עמי וּמכה נחלה מאד
18	כי גַם־נביא גם־כהן	כי כהן גם־נביא
	וְלֹא ידעו	אֲשֶׁר לא ידעו
19	אִם־בְּצִיּוֹן גָּעֲלָה נפשך	וּמִצִּיּוֹן תָּקַע נפשך[i]
	קַוֵּה לשלום	קִוִּינוּ[k] לשלום
	וּלעת מרפא	לעת מרפא

[a] Alex. לֹא רָצָם. [b] Targ. צְלוֹתְהוֹן. [c] Vid. 1:6; 4:10; 32:17. [d] Targ. דְּמִתְנַבַּן. [e] Cf. 33:6; Isa. 39:8. [f] Vid. 23:26. [g] ut 16:4. [h] ut 16:4. [i] Cf. 6:8; Ezek. 23:17. [k] Vid. 8:15.—Targ. סַבַּרְנָא.

20	ידענו יהוה רשׁענו עון אבותינו	ידענו יהוה רשׁעותינו עונות[a]
	כי חטאנו לָךְ	אבותינו כי חטאנו לְפָנֶיךָ[b]
21	אַל־תִּנְאַץ	הֶרֶף (אל־תנאף?)
	אל־תְּנַבֵּל	אל־תְּחַבֵּל (תְּאַבֵּד)
	אל־תפר בריתך אתנו	אל תפר בריתך אֲשֶׁר אתנו
22	בְּהַבְלֵי הגוים מגשׁמים	בֶּאֱלִילֵי (בִּפְסִילֵי) הגוים מגשׁים
	יתנו רבבים	יתנו רביבם (רְבָּם, רְוָיָתָם)
	יהוה אֱלֹהֵינוּ ונקוה־לך	ונקוה־לך יהוה

CAPUT XV.

1	אין נפשׁי אֶל־העם הזה שׁלח מֵעַל־פָּנַי	אין נפשׁי אֲלֵיהֶם שׁלח אֶת־העם הזה
3	ואת־הכלבים לִסְחֹב ואת־עוף השׁמים ואת־בֶּהֱמַת הארץ	ואת־הכלבים לִטְרֹף ואת־חַיַּת הארץ ואת־עוף השׁמים
4	לְזַוְעָה	לִזְוָעוֹת(?)[c]
	על־אשׁר־עשׂה	על־כָּל־אשׁר־עשׂה
5	כִּי מִי־יחמל עליך ירושׁלם ומי יָנוּד לָךְ	מי־יחמל עליך ירושׁלם ומי יִירָא (יִפְחַד) מִמֵּךְ
	לִשְׁאֹל	Desunt
6	עָלָיִךְ	
	נִלְאֵיתִי הִנָּחֵם	וְלֹא אֲנִיחם עוֹד
7	בשׁערי הָאָרֶץ שִׁכַּלְתִּי אִבַּדְתִּי את־עמי מִדַּרְכֵיהֶם לוֹא שָׁבוּ	בשׁערי עַמִּי שִׁכְּלוּ אִבְּדוּ את־עמי מִפְּנֵי רָעָתָם
8	עצמו־לִי אלמנותו	עצמו אלמנותֵיהֶם[d]
	הבאתי לָהֶם על־אם בָּחוּר שֹׁדֵד בצהרים	הבאתי על־אם בַּחוּרִים[e] שׁד בצהרים
	עיר ובהלות	עיר ובהלָה
9	ילדת הַשִּׁבְעָה	ילדת שׁבעה
	באה שִׁמְשָׁהּ בעד יוֹמָם	באה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ לָהּ בעד חֲצִי הַיּוֹם
	ושׁאריתם	שׁאריתם

[a] Targ. וְחוֹבֵי. [b] Targ. קֳדָמָךְ. [c] *ἀνάγκας*. [d] Targ. אַרְמְלָתְהוֹן.
[e] Targ. טַלְיֵיהוֹן.

	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	Deest
10	אוי־לי אִמִּי כִּי ילדתִּנִי איש ריב וְאִישׁ מדון	אוי־לי אֵם ילדתִּנִי כְּאִישׁ ריב וּמדון
	ולא־נשו־בי כֻּלֹּה מקללוני	ולא־נִשָּׁה־בי אִישׁ כֹּחִי כָּלָה בִּמקללוני
11	אָמַר יְהוָֹה אִם־לֹא שֵׁרִותִךָ לְטוֹב	אָמֵן אֲדֹנָי לַיְשָׁרִים בָּהֶם[a] (לַמְיַשְּׁרִים לֶכֶת) (?)
	בעת רָעָה ובעת צרה אֶת־ האיב	בעת רעֹתֵיהֶם ובעת צרתָם לְטוֹב אֶל־האיב
12	הירע ברזל בַּרְזֶל מִצָּפוֹן ונחשת:	הידע (הֲיִוָּדַע) ברזל וּמִצְפּוּן (וְצִפּוּי) נחשת
13	חילך ואוצרותיך לבז אתן לא בִמְחִיר וּבְכל־חטאותיך	חילך: ואוצרותיך[b] לבז אתן במחיר בכל־חטאותיך
14	והעברתי אֶת־איביך בְּאֶרֶץ לא ידעת	והעבדתיך[c] סָבִיב לְאיביך בָּאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר לֹא[d] ידעת
15	אַתָּה יָדַעְתָּ	Deest
	וְהִנָּקֶם לִי	וְנַקֵּנִי
	אל־לארך אַפְּךָ תִּקָּחֵנִי	אל־לארך אַף
	שְׂאֵתִי עליך חרפה	כִּי נָשָׂאתִי[e] עליך חרפה
16	נִמְצְאוּ דבריך וָאֹכְלֵם וַיְהִי דבריך לי	מְנַאֲצֵי דבריך כַּלֵּם וַיְהִי דברך[f] לי
	יהוה אֱלֹהֵי צבאות	יהוה צבאות
17	וָאֶעְלֹז	וְאֶעְרֹץ
	כִּי־זַעַם מִלֵּאתָנִי	כִּי־מָרָה מָלֵאתִי
18	למה הָיָה כְאֵבִי נֶצַח	למה מַכְאִיבַי יְנַצְּחוּנִי
	מֵאֲנָה הֵרָפֵא	מֵאָנָּה אֵרָפֵא
	כְּמוֹ אכזב מַיִם לא נאמנו	כְּמֵי אכזב לא נאמנים
19	לפני תעמד	ולפני תעמד
	ישבו המה	וְישבו המה
20	וּלְהַצִּילֶךָ נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	Deest
21	וְהִצַּלְתִּיךָ	וּלְהַצִּילְךָ
	מכף עָרִצִים	מכף תַּחֲלוּאִים

[a] *κατευθυνόντων αὐτῶν*. [b] Inc. vs. 13. [c] Cf. 17: 4.—Targ. וְהִשְׁתַּעְבְּדוּן לְבַעֲלֵי דְבָבֵיכוֹן. [d] Targ. דְּלָא. [e] Targ. דְּקַבֵּלִית. [f] Targ. מֵימְרָךְ.

CAPUT XVI.

1	וַיְהִי דְבַר־יְהוָֹה אֵלַי לֵאמֹר	Deest
2	לֹא־תִקַּח לְךָ אשה ולא־יהיו לך בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת	וְאַתָּה לֹא־תקח אשה אָמַר יְהוָֹה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל ולא־יהיו לך בֵּן וּבַת
4	לְדֹמֶן על־פני האדמה	לְדִמְיוֹן[a] על־פני האדמה
	וּבחרב וּברעב יכלו וְהָיְתָה נִבְלָתָם לְמַאֲכָל לעוף השמים ולבהמת הארץ	ולבהמת הארץ יהיו וּלעוף השמים בּחרב יִפְּלוּ וּברעב יכלו
5	כִּי־כה אמר יהוה	כה אמר יהוה
	בֵּית מַרְזֵחַ	בְּמַרְזֵחָם (הַמַּרְזֵחַ)
	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה אֶת־הַחֶסֶד וְאֶת־הָרַחֲמִים	Desunt
6	וּמֵתוּ גְדֹלִים וּקְטַנִּים בָּאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת לֹא יִקָּבֵרוּ	(Desunt)
	וְלֹא־יספדו להם ולא יִתְגֹּדַד ולא יִקָּרֵחַ לָהֶם	לֹא[b]־יספדו להם ולא יתגוֹדְדוּ ולא יִקָּרְחוּ
7	ולא־יִפְרְסוּ לָהֶם עַל־אֵבֶל לְנַחֲמוֹ עַל־מֵת ולא־ישקו אוֹתָם	ולא־יִפָּרֵס לָהֶם בְּאֶבְלָם לְנַחֵם עַל־מֵת ולא־ישקו אותוֹ
8	וּבית־משתה לא־תבוא	בית־משתה לא־תבוא אַתָּה
9	צְבָאוֹת	Deest
	קול ששון וקול שמחה	קול שמחה וקול ששון
10	את כל־הרָעָה הַגְּדוֹלָה הַזֹּאת וּמה עוננו	את כל־הרעוֹת הָאֵלֶּה מֶה עוננו
11	על אשר־עזבו אבותיכם אותי	על אשר־עזבו אותי אבותיכם
12	לַעֲשׂוֹת	Deest
	שְׁרִרוּת לִבּוֹ־הרע	תַּאֲוַת[c] לִבְּכֶם־הרע
13	עַל־הארץ	אֶל־הארץ[d]
	יוֹמָם וָלַיְלָה	Deest
	לֹא־אֶתֵּן	לֹא־יִתְּנוּ
14	ולא־יֵאָמֵר עוד חי־יהוה אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱלָה את־בני ישראל	ולא־יֹאמְרוּ עוד[e] חי־יהוה הַמַּעֲלֶה את־בני ישראל

---

[a] Vid. 8:2; 9:21. [b] Inc. vs. 6. [c] τῶν ἀρεστῶν. [d] Targ. לְאַרְעָא.
[e] Targ. וְלָא יְהוֹן מִשְׁתָּעַן עוֹד.

15	אֶת־בְּנֵי ישׂראל	אֶת־בֵּית ישׂראל
	אשׁר הִדִּיחָם שׁמה וַהֲשִׁבוֹתִים עַל־אדמתם	אשׁר הֻדְּחוּ שׁמה וְהֲשִׁבוֹתִים אֶל־אדמתכ[a]
17	לֹא נִסְתְּרוּ מִלְּפָנָי	Deest
	ולֹא־נִצְפַּן עֲוֹנָם	ולֹא־נִצְפְּנוּ עוֹנוֹתֵיהֶם[b]
18	ושׁלמתי רִאשׁוֹנָה משׁנה עֲוֹנָם וחַטָּאתָם עַל־חַלְּלָם	ושׁלמתי משׁנה רָעֹתֵיהֶם וחטאתֵיהֶם עַל־אֲשֶׁר חִלְּלוּ[c]
	בנבלַת	בנבלַת
	וְתוֹעֲבוֹתֵיהם מלאו	וַעֲוֹנוֹתֵיהם אֲשֶׁר מלאו בָּהֶם
19	עֻזִּי וּמָעֻזִּי	אַתָּה עזי וְעֶזְרִי (וְעֶזְרָתִי)
	בְּיוֹם צָרָה	בִּימֵי רָעָה
	מֵאַפְסֵי־ארץ	מִקְצֵה הָארץ
	אַךְ־שׁקר נחלו אבותינו הֶבֶל	אֵיךְ שׁקר נחלו אבותינו הֲבָלִים
21	הנני מודיעם בפעם הזאת אודיעם את־ידי ואת־גבורתי	הנני מודיעם בפעם (בָּעֵת) הזאת את־ידי וְאודיעם את גבורתי

CAPUT XVII.

1	חַטַּאת יְהוּדָה כְּתוּבָה בְּעֵט בַּרְזֶל בְּצִפֹּרֶן שָׁמִיר חֲרוּשָׁה עַל־לוּחַ לִבָּם וּלְקַרְנוֹת מִזְבְּחוֹתֵיכֶם׃	Desunt
2	כִּזְכֹּר בְּנֵיהֶם מִזְבְּחוֹתָם וַאֲשֵׁרֵיהֶם עַל־עֵץ רַעֲנָן עַל גְּבָעוֹת הַגְּבֹהוֹת׃	
3	הֲרָרִי בַּשָּׂדֶה חֵילְךָ כָל־אוֹצְרוֹתֶיךָ לָבַז אֶתֵּן בָּמֹתֶיךָ בְּחַטָּאת בְּכָל־	
4	גְּבוּלֶיךָ׃ וְשָׁמַטְתָּה וּבְךָ מִנַּחֲלָתְךָ אֲשֶׁר נָתַתִּי לָךְ וְהַעֲבַדְתִּיךָ אֶת־אֹיְבֶיךָ בָּאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדָעְתָּ כִּי־אֵשׁ קְדַחְתֶּם בְּאַפִּי עַד־עוֹלָם	
5	תּוּקָד׃ כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה	

[a] Targ. לְאַרְעֲהוֹן. [b] Targ. וְלָא מִטַּמְּרָן חוֹבֵיהוֹן. [c] Vid. 18:23; 31:34; 36:6.—Targ. חוֹבֵיהוֹן וְחָטָאֵיהוֹן עַל דְּאַחֲלוּ.

	אשר יִבְטַח באדם ושם בָּשָׂר זרעו	אשר מִבְטָח לוֹ באדם ושם בְּשַׂר זרעו עָלָיו
6	ושכן חֲרֵרִים במדבר ארץ מלֵחה וְלא תשב	ושכן מְלֵחִים ובמדבר וּבארץ מלחה אֲשֶׁר לא[a] תשב
7	ברוך הגבר	וּברוך הגבר
8	כעץ	כעץ פּוֹרֵחַ
	יְשַׁלַּח שָׁרָשָׁיו וְלא יִרְאֶ	יַשְׁלִיךְ שָׁרְשׁוֹ לא יָרֵא (= יִירָא)
	והיה עלהוּ רענן וּבשנת בצרת לא יִדְאָג	והיה עליהוּ (עליו) עָלֶה רענן בשנת בצרת לא יִפְחַד (יִירָא)?
9	עָקֹב הלב מכל וְאָנֻשׁ הוא מי ידענו	עָמֹק הלב[b] מכל וֶאֱנֹשׁ[c] הוא וּמי ידענו
10	בחן כליות ולתת לאיש כדרכוֹ כִּפְרִי מעלליו	וּבחן כליות וּלתת לאיש כדרכיו וּכִפרי מעלליו
11	קרא דגר וְלא ילד עשה עֹשֶׁר וְלא במשפט	קָרָא קרא דגר (אָגר) אֲשֶׁר לא ילד עשה עָשְׁרוֹ לא במשפט
12	מֵרִאשׁוֹן מְקוֹם	Desunt
13	יְסוּרַי בָּאָרֶץ יכתבו	סוּרַי (סָרֵי) עַל־הָאָרֶץ יכתבו
	מקור מַיִם־חיים	מקור חיים[d]
15	יבוא נָא	יבוא
16	לא־אצתי מֵרֹעֶה אחריך ויום אָנוּשׁ	לא נִלְאֵיתִי[e] מְלֶכֶת אחריך ויום אֱנוֹשׁ[f]
	מוצא שפתי נֹכַח פניך	מוֹצָאֵי שפתי לְפניך
17	אל־תהיה־לי לִמְחִתָּה	אל־תהיה־לי לְנֵכָר (לְזָר)[g]
	אַתָּה	Deest
18	וּמשנה שברון	משנה שברון
19	אֵלַי	Deest
	בשער בני־עָם	בשַׁעֲרֵי בני עַמְּךָ
	בוֹ (bis)	בָּהֶם (bis)
20	יֹשְׁבֵי	Deest
21	הִשָּׁמְרוּ בְּנַפְשׁוֹתֵיכֶם	שִׁמרו נפשותיכם
	וַהֲבֵאתֶם בְּשַׁעֲרֵי ירושלם	וְאַל־תֵּצְאוּ מִשַּׁעֲרֵי ירושלם

[a] Targ. דְּלָא. [b] ut Ps. 64: 7 (Gk. & Heb.). [c] Vid. vs. 16. [d] ut Ps. 36: 10; Prov. 16: 22. [e] Targ. לָא כַּסְבֵית. [f] Vid. vs. 9. [g] εἰς ἀλλοτρίωσιν.

22	וְקִדַּשְׁתֶּם	קַדְּשׁוּ
23	ויקשו את־ערפם לבלתי	ויקשו את־ערפם מֵאֲבוֹתֵיהֶם לבלתי
	שׁוֹמֵעַ	שְׁמֹעַ אֵלַי
24	אם־שָׁמֹעַ תשמעון	אם־תשמעון
	בֹּהּ	Deest
25	רכבים בָּרֶכֶב ובַסּוּסִים	וְרֹכבים על־רִכְבֵּיהֶם וְסוּסֵיהֶם
	אִישׁ יהודה וישבי ירושלם	אַנְשֵׁי יהודה וְהַיּוֹשְׁבִים בִּירושלם
	וְיָשְׁבָה העיר הזאת	ותֵּשֵׁב (וְנוֹשְׁבָה) העיר הזאת
26	ומִסְּבִיבוֹת ירושלם	ומִסָּבִיב ירושלם
	ומִן־השפלה	ומֵאֶרֶץ השפלה
	ומִן־הַנגב	ומִן־אֲשֶׁר לַנגב
	עֹלָה וְזֶבַח ומנחה ולבונה וּמבאי	עוֹלֹת[a] וּזְבָחִים וּקְטֹרֶת וּמִנְחָה(?)
	תודה בית יהוה	ולבונה מבאי תודה אֶל־בית[b] יהוה
27	ואם־לא	וְהָיָה אם־לא
	וּלבלתי שאת משא וּבא בשערי	לבלתי שאת משא וּלְבִלְתִּי בא
	ירושלם	בשערי ירושלם
	אַרְמְנוֹת ירושלם	חוּצוֹת[c] ירושלם

CAPUT XVIII.

1	אל־ירמיהו מאת יהוה	מאת יהוה אל־ירמיהו
2	אַשְׁמִיעֲךָ את־דברי	תִּשְׁמַע את־דברי
3	על־הָאָבְנָיִם	על־הָאֲבָנִים
4	בַּחֹמֶר בְּיַד הַיּוֹצֵר	בְּיָדָיו
	כאשר ישר בעינֵי הַיּוֹצֵר	כאשר ישר בעינָיו
6	נְאֻם־יְהוָה	Deest
	כחמר בְּיַד היוצר כֵּן אתם בידִי	כחומר היוצר אתם בידָי
	בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל	
7	וְעל־ממלכה לִנְתוֹשׁ וְלִנְתוֹץ	אוֹ על־ממלכה לְנַתְּשָׁם
8	מֵרָעָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתִּי עָלָיו	מִכָּל־רעוֹתֵיהֶם
	אשר חשבתי לעשות לוֹ	אשר חשבתי לעשות לָהֶם

[a] Targ. עֲלָוָן. [b] Targ. לְבֵית. [c] *ἄμφοδα*.

9	וְעַל־ממלכה לִבְנוֹת וְלִנְטֹעַ	וּממלכה לְהִבָּנוֹת וּלְהִנָּטַע
10	ועשה הָרַעָה בְּעֵינַי	ועשו הָרָעָה לְפָנַי[a]
	לְהֵיטִיב אוֹתוֹ	לַעֲשׂוֹת לָהֶם
11	אֱמָר־נָא אֶל־אִישׁ יהודה וְעַל־יושבי ירושלם	אמֹר אֶל־אַנְשֵׁי יהודה וְאֶל־יושבי[b] ירושלם
	לֵאמֹר כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָֹה	Deest
	שׁוּבוּ נא	יָשׁוּב נא
	והיטיבו דַרְכֵיכֶם וּמעלליכם	והיטיבו מעלליכם
12	ואָמרו נוֹאָשׁ	ויאמרו נִתְאוֹשֵׁשׁ
	מַחְשְׁבוֹתֵינוּ	מִשְׁבוֹתֵינוּ
	שְׁרִרוּת	תַּאֲוַת[c]
14	היעזב מצור שָׂדַי שלג לבנון אם־יִנָּתְשׁוּ מים זָרִים קָרִים נוזלים	היעזבו מצור שָׂדַיִם אם־שלג (וְשלג) מִלְּבנון אם־ינטשו מים זָרָם קָדִים נוזלים
15	וַיַּכְשִׁלוּם	וְיִכָּשְׁלוּ
	דרך לא סְלוּלָה	אֵין לָהֶם דרך לַעֲבֹר
16	שְׁרוּקֹת עולם	וּשְׁרוּקֹת עולם
	כל עוֹבֵר עליה ישם ויניד בראשו	כל הָעֹבְרִים עליה ישמו ויניד בראשָם
17	אפיצם לפני אוֹיֵב עֹרֶף וְלֹא־פָנִים אֶראם בְּיוֹם אֵידם	אפיצם לפני אוֹיְבֵיהֶם[d] אַראם יום אָבְדם
18	מחשבות	מחשבָה
	ונכהו בַלָּשׁוֹן וְאַל־נקשיבה אל־כל־דבריו	ונכהו בְּלשון ונקשיבה אל־כל־דבריו
19	הקשיבה יהוה אלי ושמע לקול יְרִיבָי	הקשיבה אלי יהוה ושמע לקול ריבִי[e]
20	כי־כָרו שוּחה לנפשי	כי־קָרְאו (דִּבְּרוּ) שִׂיחה לנפשי
		וּמִכְשֹׁלָם טָמְנוּ לִי
21	והגרם על־ידי־חרב ותהינה נשיהם	והאֲגרם (וְהַאָסְפֵם) על־ידי־חרב תהינה נשיהם
	בחוריהם מֻכֵּי־חרב	וּבחורים נֹפְלֵי־חרב

[a] Targ. קֳדָמַי. [b] Targ. וּלְיָתְבֵי. [c] τὰ ἀρεστά. [d] Targ. בַּעֲלֵי דְבָבֵיהוֹן.
[e] ut 20:12.—Targ. עוּלְבָנִי.

22	תִּשָּׁמַע זעקה מִבָּתֵּיהם כִּי־תביא עליהם גדוד	תְּהִי זעקה בְּבתיהם תביא עליהם גדודים[a] (שֹׁדְדִים)
	כי כרו שׁוּחָה ללכדני	כי עָרְכוּ[b] (כרו) שִׂיחה ללכדני
	טמנו לְרַגְלָי	טמנו לִי
23	עֲוֹנָם וחַטָּאתָם	עֲוֹנֹתֵיהֶם וחַטֹּאתֵיהֶם[c]
	וְיִהְיוּ מֻכְשָׁלִים לפניך	יְהִי מִכְשֹׁלָם לפניך

CAPUT XIX.

1	כֹּה אמר יהוה	אָז אמר יהוה אֵלַי[d]
	יוֹצֵר חרש ומזקני העם ומִזִּקְנֵי הכהנים	יוֹצֵר חרש וְלָקַחְתָּ (וְהֵבֵאתָ[e]) מזקני העם וּמִן־הכהנים
2	בֶּן־הִנֹּם	בְּנֵי בְנֵיהֶם (בְּנֵי נִינָם)
	שער החרסוּת	שער החרסִית[f]
	את־הדברים	את־כָּל־הדברים הָאֵלֶּה
3	ואמרת שמעו דבר־יהוה מלכי יהודה וישבי ירושלם	ואמרת אֲלֵיהֶם שמעו דבר־יהוה מלכי יהודה וְאַנְשֵׁי יְהוּדָה והַיֹּשְׁבִים בִּירושלם וְהַבָּאִים בַּשְּׁעָרִים הָאֵלֶּה[g]
	יהוה צְבָאוֹת	יהוה
	הנני מביא רעה על־המקום הזה	הנני מביא על־המקום הזה רעה
4	אשר לא־יְדָעוּם	אשר לא־יִרְאוּ
	ומלאו את־המקום הזה	מלאו את־המקום הזה
	דַּם נקים	דְּמֵי נקים
5	אֶת־במות הַבעל	במות לַבעל
	עֹלוֹת לַבָּעַל	Deest
	וְלֹא דִבַּרְתִּי ולא עָלְתָה עַל־לבי	ולא חָשַׁבְתִּי בְּלבי
7	ובַקֹּתִי את־עצת יהודה וירושלם	וּבָקַעְתִּי(?) את־עצת יהודה וַעֲצַת יְרושלם
	וביַד מבקשי נפשם ונתתי את־	וּבִידֵי מבקשי נפשם ונתתי את־

[a] Targ. מְשֹׁדְדִין. [b] ἐνεχείρησαν. [c] Vid. 16:18; 31:34; 36:3—Targ. חוֹבֵיהוֹן וְחַטָּאֵיהוֹן. [d] Targ. אֲמַר יְיָ לִי. [e] Targ. וְתִדְבַּר. [f] τῆς χαρσειθ. [g] ut 7:2; 17:20; 22:2.

	נִבְלָתָם לְמַאֲכָל לְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם	נִבְלָתָם לְמַאֲכָל לְעוֹפוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם
	וּלְבֶהֱמַת הָאָרֶץ	וּלְבַהֲמוֹת הָאָרֶץ
8	עַל־כָּל־מַכֹּתֶהָ	עַל־כָּל־מַכָּתָהּ
9	וְהַאֲכַלְתִּים	וְאָכְלוּ
	בְּמָצוֹר וּבְמָצוֹק	בְּמָצוֹר וּבְמָצוֹק
	וּמְבַקְשֵׁי נַפְשָׁם	Deest
11	וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם	וְאָמַרְתָּ
	יהוה צְבָאוֹת	יהוה
	כַּאֲשֶׁר יִשְׁבֹּר אֶת־כְּלִי הַיּוֹצֵר	כַּאֲשֶׁר יִשָּׁבֵר כְּלִי־חָרֶשׂ
	וּבְתֹפֶת יִקְבְּרוּ מֵאֵין מָקוֹם לִקְבּוֹר	Deest
12	כֵּן־אֶעֱשֶׂה לַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה נְאֻם־	כֵּן־אֶעֱשֶׂה נְאֻם־יהוה לַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה
	יהוה וּלְיוֹשְׁבָיו וְלָתֵת אֶת־	וְלַיּוֹשְׁבִים בּוֹ לָתֵת אֶת־הָעִיר
	הָעִיר הַזֹּאת כְּתֹפֶת	הַזֹּאת כְּתֹפֶת
13	וְהָיוּ בָּתֵּי יְרוּשָׁלַם וּבָתֵּי מַלְכֵי	וּבָתֵּי יְרוּשָׁלַם וּבָתֵּי מַלְכֵי
	יְהוּדָה כִּמְקוֹם הַתֹּפֶת	יְהוּדָה יִהְיוּ כִּמְקוֹם הַתֹּפֶת
	הַטְּמֵאִים לְכֹל הַבָּתִּים אֲשֶׁר	מִטֻּמְאוֹתֵיהֶם בְּכָל הַבָּתִּים אֲשֶׁר
	קִטְּרוּ	בָּהֶם קִטְּרוּ
	וְהַסֵּךְ נְסָכִים	וַיַּסִּיכוּ (וַיִּסְּכוּ) נְסָכִים[a]
15	יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה
	אֶל־הָעִיר הַזֹּאת וְעַל־כָּל־	עַל־הָעִיר[b] הַזֹּאת וְעַל־כָּל עָרֶיהָ וְעַל־
	עָרֶיהָ	כָּל־כְּפָרֶיהָ (שְׂדוֹתֶיהָ, מִגְרָשֶׁיהָ)
	לְבִלְתִּי שְׁמוֹעַ אֶת־דְּבָרָי	לְבִלְתִּי שְׁמוֹעַ אֶל־מִצְוֹתָי (?)

CAPUT XX.

1	וְהוּא־פָקִיד נָגִיד בְּבֵית יהוה	וְהוּא הָיָה פָּקִיד נָגִיד בֵּית יהוה
2	וַיַּכֶּה פַשְׁחוּר אֵת יִרְמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא	וַיַּכֵּהוּ וַיַּשְׁלֵךְ אֹתוֹ אֶל־הַמַּהְפֶּכֶת[c]
	וַיִּתֵּן אֹתוֹ עַל־הַמַּהְפֶּכֶת אֲשֶׁר	אֲשֶׁר הָיְתָה בְשַׁעַר הַבַּיִת הַפֹּנֶה
	בְּשַׁעַר בִּנְיָמִן הָעֶלְיוֹן	לַבַּיִת הָעֶלְיוֹן (בְּנָיָן מְמֻנֶּה?)
3	וַיְהִי מִמָּחֳרָת	Deest
	קָרָא יְהוָה	קָרָא
	כִּי אִם־מָגוֹר מִסָּבִיב	כִּי אִם־מָגוֹר

[a] Targ. וּנְסִיכוּ נִסְכִין. [b] Targ. עַל קַרְתָּא. [c] Targ. לְבֵית סִפְתָא.

4	כִּי־כֹה אמר למגוֹר לְךָ וּלְכל־אהביך ואת־כל־יהודה אתן בְּיַד מלך־ בבל והגלָם בָּבֶלָה והכָּם בֶּחָרֶב	לָכֵן אמר למגוּר עִם־כל־אהביך וְאוֹתְךָ ואת־כל־יהודה אתן בִּידֵי מלך־בבל והגלָם והכֹּם בַּחֲרָבוֹת
5	ואת־כל־יגיעָהּ וְאֶת־כָּל־יְקָרָהּ ואת כל־אוצרות מַלְכֵי יהודה אֶתֵּן בְּיַד איביהֶם וּבְזָזוּם וּלְקָחוּם והביאום בבלה	ואת־כל־יגיעָהּ ואת כל־אוצרות מֶלֶךְ יהודה בִּידֵי אֹיְבָיו והביאום בבלה
6	ואתה פַשְׁחוּר וכל ישְׁבֵי ביתך ובבל תָּבוֹא וְשָׁם תמות בַּשָּׁקֶר	ואתה וכל הַיֹּשְׁבִים בְּביתך וּבְבבל תמות שְׁקָרִים
7	חִזַּקְתַּנִי ותוכל כל־היום כֻּלֹּה לֹעֵג לי	חָזַקְתָּ ותוכל כל־היום כָּלָה (הַ)נִּלְעָג[a]
8	כי־מִדֵּי אֲדַבֵּר אזְעָק לי לחרפה כל־הַיּוֹם	כי־בְמְרִי הַדָּבָר (בְּמְרִי דְבָרִי) אצְחָק (אשְׂחָק) לחרפה לי כל־יוֹמִי
9	לא־אזכְּרֶנּוּ ולא־אדבר עוד בִּשמו והיה בְלִבִּי כאש בערת עָצֻר בעצמתי ונלאיתי כַלְכֵּל ולא אוּכָל	לא־אזכֹּר שֵׁם יְהוָֹה ולא־אדבר עוד עַל־שמו והיה כאש בערת יָקֶד בעצמתי ונלאיתי כָלִיל (כֹּל כֹּל) ולא אוכַל נְשׂוֹא (שְׂאֵת)
10	מָגוֹר מסביב הַגִּידוּ וְנַגִּידֶנּוּ כל אֱנוֹשׁ שְׁלֹמִי שֹׁמְרֵי צַלְעִי	מְגוֹרִים מסביב[b] גּוּדוּ וּנְגוּדֶנּוּ (גֹּדוּ וְנָגֹדָה עָלָיו?) כל אַנְשֵׁי (שְׁלֹמוֹ) מֵרֵעָיו שֹׁמְרוּ עֲצָתוֹ (מַחֲשַׁבְתּוֹ)
11	רֹדְפַי יִכָּשְׁלוּ וְלֹא יכלו כי־לא הִשְׂכִּילוּ כלמַּת עולם לא תשכֵחַ	רָדְפוּ וְהִשְׂכִּל לא יכלו כי־לא יָדְעוּ כלמוֹתֵיהֶם עולם לא תשכַחְנָה
12	וַיהוה צְבָאוֹת בחן צַדִּיק ראה כליות וָלֵב אראה נקמתך מֵהם את־רִיבִי	יהוה בחן צֶדֶק (צְדָקוֹת) ראה כליות וּלְבָבוֹת אראה נקמתך בָּהם את־רִיבָי (ריבוֹתַי)

[a] *μυκτηριζόμενος*. [b] Targ. מִתְכַּנְשִׁין מִסְחוֹר סְחוֹר.

13	הללו אֶת־יְהוָה	הללוהו (הללו אותו)
15	אֲשֶׁר בִּשַּׂר את־אבי לאמר ילד־לך בֵּן זכר שַׂמֵּחַ שִׂמְּחָהוּ׃	הַמְבַשֵּׂר את־אבי לאמר ילד־לך זכר שָׂמֵחַ׃
16	וְהָיָה האיש	יְהִיֶה[a] האיש
	אשר־הפך יהוה	אשר־הפך יהוה בְּאַף[b]
	וְשָׁמַע זְעקה	יִשְׁמַע[c] זעקה
	בְּעֵת צהרים	בַּצָּהֳרִים
17	אשר לא־מותתני מֵרחם ותהי־לי אִמִּי קברי ורַחְמָהּ הרת עולם	אשר לא־מותתני בָּרחם ותהי־לי רַחֲמִי קברי והֶרֶחֶם הרת עולם
18	למה זה מרחם יצאתי	למה זה יצאתי מרחם

CAPUT XXI.

1	אל־ירמיהו מאת יהוה	מאת יהוה אל־ירמיהו
	מַעֲשֵׂיָה	בַּעֲשֵׂיָה[d]
2	דְּרָשׁ־נא בעדנו את־יהוה כי נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מלך־בבל נִלְחָם עלינו	דרשׁ בעדינו את־יהוה כי מלך־בבל קָם עלינו
	אוֹתָנוּ	Deest
3	ויאמר ירמיהו אליהם	ויאמר אליהם ירמיהו
	אל־צדקיהו	אל־צדקיהו מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה
4	כה־אמר יהוה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	כה־אמר יהוה
	אֲשֶׁר בְּיֶדְכֶם	Deest
	אֶת־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל וְאת־הכשדים	את־הכשדים
5	וּבאף ובחמה וּבְקֶצֶף גָּדוֹל	באף ובחמה גְּדוֹלָה
6	יושבֵי הָעיר הזאת וְאת־הָאָדָם ואת־הבהֵמָה בדבר גדול יָמֻתוּ	כָּל־היוֹשְׁבִים בָּעיר הזאת את־הָאֲנָשִׁים ואת־הבהמות בדבר גדול וָמֵתוּ (וְימתו)
7	נְאֻם־יהוה	כֹּה־אָמַר יהוה
	וְאֶת־הנשארים בעיר הזאת מן־הדבר מן־החרב ומן הרעב	הנשארים בעיר הזאת מן־הדבר וּמן־הרעב ומן־החרב[e]

---

[a] Inc. vs. 16. [b] Cf. Deut. 29:22.—Targ. הַהֲפַךְ יְיָ בְּרוּגְזֵיהּ. [c] Targ. וְיִשְׁמַע. [d] ut I. Chron. 6:25. [e] Targ. וּמִן חַרְבָּא.

	בְּיַד נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל	Deest
	וּבְיַד איביהם וּבְיַד מבקשי נַפְשָׁם	בְּיַדֵי איביהם מבקשי נפשׁוֹתֵיהֶם
	והִכָּם לפי־חרב לא־יָחוּס עליהם וְלֹא יַחְמֹל ולא יְרַחֵם	והִכֵּם לפי־חרב לא־אָחוּס עליהם ולא אֲרַחֲמֵם[a]
8	וְאל־העם הזה	אל־העם הזה
	הנני נֹתֵן	הנני נָתַתִּי
9	וּבַדָּבֶר	Deest
	וְנָפַל על־הכשדים	לִנְפֹּל על־הכשדים
	יִחְיֶה והיתה־לוֹ נפשו לשלל	יִחְיֶה והיתה נפשו[b] לשלל וְחָיָת
10	כי־שמתי פני בָּעיר הזאת	כי־שמתי פני עַל־הָעיר הזאת
	נְאֻם־יְהוָה בְּיַד מלך־בבל	בְּיַדֵי מלך־בבל
11	וּלְבית מלך יהודה	בית מלך יהודה
12	והצילו גזול מיד עֹשֵׁק פן־תֵּצֵא כאש	וְאַשְּׁרוּ והצילו גזול מיד עֹשְׁקוֹ[c] פן־תִּצַּת[d] כאש
	מִפְּנֵי רֹעַ מַעַלְלֵיהֶם	Deest
13	צוּר המישר	צוֹר[e] המישר
	נְאֻם־יְהוָה	Deest
	ומי יבוא במעונוֹתֵינוּ	ומי יבוא במעוֹנֵנוּ
14	וּפָקַדְתִּי עֲלֵיכֶם כִּפְרִי מַעַלְלֵיכֶם נְאֻם־יְהוָה	Desunt

CAPUT XXII.

1	רד	לֵךְ וָרד[f]
2	וַעֲבָדֶיךָ ועמך הבאים	וּבֵיתְךָ ועמך וְהבאים
3	מיד עָשׁוֹק	מיד עֹשְׁקוֹ[g]
	יתום	וְיתום
4	ישבים לְדוד על־כִּסְאוֹ רכבים בָּרֶכֶב ובסוסים הוּא וַעֲבָדָו ועמו	ישבים על־כִּסֵּא דוד[h] וְרכבים על־מֶרְכָּבוֹת[i] ובסוסים הֵמָּה וַעֲבְדֵיהֶם ועמם

---

[a] Cf. 13:14. [b] Vid. 38:2; 39:17. [c] Vid. 22:3.—Targ. דְּאָנֵס לֵיהּ. [d] Targ. דִּלְמָא יִדְלַק. [e] Σόρ. [f] ut Exod. 19:24; 32:7. [g] Vid. 21:12.—Targ. דְּאָנֵס לֵיהּ. [h] ut vs. 2; 17:25. [i] Targ. בִּרְתִיכִין.

5	ואם לא תִשְׁמְעוּ	ואם לא תַעֲשׂוּ
6	לא נוֹשָׁבָה	לא נושבוּ
7	וקִדַּשְׁתִּי עליך משחִתים איש	וְהֵבֵאתִי (וּפָקַדְתִּי) עליך משחית
	וְכֵלָיו	איש וְכֵלָיו (וְכֵילַפּוֹ)
	עַל־האש	אֶל־האש[a]
8	ועברו גוים רַבִּים עַל־העיר	ועֹברו גוים בְּתוֹךְ העיר (בָּעִיר)
	הזאת ואמְרוּ	הזאת ואמַר
	לעיר הגדולה הזאת	לעיר הזאת הגדולה
10	ואל־תָּנֻדוּ לו	ואל־תְּקוֹנְנוּ לו
11	אֶל־שלם	עַל־שלם[b]
	מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה	Deest
12	כי בִּמְקום אשר־הִגְלוּ	כי אִם[c]־בַּמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה אשר־הִגְלֵיתִי
13	הוי בנה ביתו בְּלֹא־צדק	הַבֹּנֶה[d] ביתו לֹא־בְצדק ועליותיו
	ועליותיו בְּלֹא משפט	לא במשפט
14	הָאֹמֵר אֶבְנֶה־לִּי	בָּנִיתָ לְּךָ
	ועליות	עליות
	וְקָרַע לו חלוני וְסָפוּן בארז	קְרֻעִים חלונים וּסְפוּנִים בארז וּמְשׁוּחִים
	וּמָשׁוֹחַ בששר	בששר
15	כי אתה מתחרה בָאָרֶז אביך	כי אתה מתחרה בְּאָחָז[e] אָבִיךָ
	הֲלוֹא אָכַל וְשָׁתָה וְעָשָׂה משפט	לא יֹאכְלוּ וְלֹא יִשְׁתּוּ טוב לְךָ
	וצדקה אָז טוב לו	עֲשֵׂה משפט וצדקה
16	דָּן דִּין־עני וְאביון	לֹא יָדְעוּ לֹא דָנוּ דִין עני וְלֹא דִין אביון
	אָז טוב	Deest
	הלוא־הִיא הַדַּעַת אתי	הלא־דַעְתְּךָ אתי
17	כִּי אין עיניך וְלבך כי אם־עַל־	הִנֵּה אין עיניך וְאֵין לבך טוב כי
	בצעך ועַל־דם־הנקי לשפוך	אם־אֶל־בצעך ואֶל־דם־הנקי
	ועַל־העשק ועַל־הַמְּרוּצָה	לְשָׁפְכוֹ ואֶל־מַעֲשַׁקּוֹת ואֶל־רֶצַח[f]
	לעשות	לעשותם
18	אֶל־יהויקים	עַל[g]־יהויקים
	מלך יהודה	מלך יהודה וְעַל־הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה
	הוי אָחִי וְהוֹי אחות לא־יספדו	הוי אח וְלֹא־יספדו לו אוֹי לִי
	לו הוי אדון וְהוֹי הֹדֹה	אדון

[a] Targ. לְנוּרָא. [b] Targ. עַל שַׁלּוּם. [c] Targ. אֱלָהֵן. [d] Targ. דְּבָנֵי.
[e] Targ. כְּבַלְבָּא קַדְמָאָה. [f] εἰς φόνον. [g] Targ. עַל.

19	קבורת חמור יקבר סחוב והַשְׁלֵךְ מהלאה לשַׁעֲרֵי ירושלם	קבורת חמור יקברו סחוב והָשְׁלַךְ מהלאה לשַׁעַר ירושלם
20	עלי הלבנון וצעקי וּבַבשן תני קולך	עלי אֶל־הלבנון וצעקי וְאֶל־הַבשן תני קולך
	מֵעֲבָרִים	מֵעֵבֶר־יָם (לְעֵבֶר־הַיָּם)
21	דברתי אליך בְּשַׁלְוֹתַיִךְ אמרת כִּי לא־שמעת	דברתי אליך בְּשָׁלוֹתֵךְ וְאמרת לא־שמעת
22	בשבי יֵלֵכוּ	בשבי יֵצֵאוּ
	מכל רָעָתֵךְ	מכל רֵעֹתַיִךְ (רֵעַיִךְ)
23	מַה־נֵּחַנְתִּי	נֶאֱנַחַתְּ (תֵּאָנְחִי)
	חבלים חִיל כילדה	חבלים כילדה
24	כִּי אם־יהיה כניהו	אם־הָיֹה יהיה יְכניהו
	כִּי משם אתקנך	משם אתקנך
25	ונתתיך בְּיַד מבקשי נפשך וּבְיַד אשר אתה יגור מפניהם	ונתתיך בִּידֵי מבקשי נפשך אשר אתה יגור מפניהם
	וּבְיַד נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל	Deest
	וּבְיַד הכשדים	בִּידֵי הכשדים
26	עַל הָאָרֶץ אַחֶרֶת אשר לא־ילדתֶּם שם	אֶל־אֶרֶץ[a] אשר לא־ילדתָּ שם
27	וְעַל־הארץ	וְאֶל־הארץ[b]
	לָשׁוּב שָׁם שָׁמָּה לא ישובו	לְבַל ישובו
28	הַעֶצֶב נבזה נָפוּץ הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה כניהו אִם־כלי אין חפץ בו מַדּוּעַ הוּטְלוּ הוּא וְזַרְעוֹ והשלכו עַל־הָאָרֶץ אשר לא־ידעו	נבזה יכניהו כִּכְלִי[c] אין חפץ בו כִּי הוּטַל והשלַךְ אֶל־אָרֶץ אשר לא־ידע
29	אֶרֶץ ארץ ארץ	ארץ ארץ
30	כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָֹה כִּתְבוּ	כְּתֹב
	לא־יִצְלַח בְּיָמָיו	Deest
	לא יצלח מזרעו אִישׁ ומושל	כי לא יצמח מזרעו מושל

[a] Targ. לְאַרַע. [b] Targ. וּלְאַרְעָא. [c] Targ. כְּמָנָא.

CAPUT XXIII.

1	מאבדים ומפצים את־צאן	הַמאבדים וְהַמפצים[a] את־צאן
	מרעיתִי נְאֻם־יְהֹוָה	מרעיתָם[b]
2	יהוה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה
	על־הרעים הָרֹעִים את־עמי	על־הרעים את־עמי
	אֶת־רע מעלליכם נְאֻם־יְהֹוָה	כְּרע מעלליכם
3	את־שארית צֹאנִי	את־שארית עַמִּי[c]
	מִכֹּל הָאֲרָצוֹת	עַל־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ
	עַל־נויהן	אֶל־נויהן[d]
4	והקמתי עֲלֵיהם רעים וְרָעוּם	והקמתי לָהם רעים אֲשֶׁר יִרְעוּם
	וְלֹא יִפָּקֵדוּ	Deest
6	תושע יהודה	וְתושע יהודה
	צִדְקֵנוּ	יְהוֹצָדָק
7	את־בְּנֵי ישראל	את־בֵּית ישראל
8	אשר הֶעֱלָה וַאֲשֶׁר הֵבִיא אֶת־	אשר קִבֵּץ כָּל־זרע ישראל
	זרע בֵּית ישראל	
	אשר הִדַּחְתִּים שם וְיָשְׁבוּ עַל־	אשר הִדִּיחָם שם וַיְשִׁיבֵם אֶל־
	אדמתם	אדמתם
9	לַנבאים	בַּנבאים
	כאיש שִׁכּוֹר וכגבר עֲבָרוֹ יין	כאיש שָׁבוּר וכגבר עצוּר (עָכוּר[e]?) יין
	ומפני דִּבְרֵי קָדְשׁוֹ	ומפני הֲדַר כְּבוֹדו
10	כִּי מְנָאֲפִים מָלְאָה הָאָרֶץ	Deest
	כי־מפני אָלָה	כי־מפני אֵלֶּה
	נאות מדבר	נאות הַמדבר
	וגבורתם לא־כן	וגבורתם כן
11	כי־גַם־נביא גַם־כהן	כי־כהן וְנביא
	מָצָאתִי רָעָתָם נְאֻם־יְהֹוָה	רָאִיתִי רעוֹתֵיהֶם[f] (רעתם)
12	כַּחלקלקות	לַחלקלקות
	ידחו	וְידחו
	שנת פקדתם נְאֻם־יְהֹוָה	בִּשנת[g] פקדתם

---

[a] Targ. דִּמְאַבְדִין וּמְבַדְּרִין. [b] ut 10:21. [c] Targ. יַת שְׁאָרָא דְעַמִּי. [d] Targ. לְאַתְרֵיהוֹן. [e] *συνεχόμενος*. [f] Targ. גְּלֵין קֳדָמַי בִּישְׁתְהוֹן. [g] Vid. 11:23; 48:44.

14	נֹאֹף וְהָלֹךְ בַּשֶּׁקֶר וְחִזְּקוּ יְדֵי מְרֵעִים לְבִלְתִּי־שָׁבוּ אִישׁ מֵרָעָתוֹ	מְנָאֲפִים וְהֹלְכִים בִּשְׁקָרִים וּמְחַזְּקִים יְדֵי רַבִּים לְבִלְתִּי־שׁוּב[a] אִישׁ מִדַּרְכּוֹ הָרָעָה
15	יהוה צְבָאוֹת עַל־הַנְּבִאִים לַעֲנָה לְכָל־הָאָרֶץ	יהוה עֹנִי[b] בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ
16	אל תשמעו עַל־דברי הנבאים הַנִּבְּאִים לָכֶם מהבלים הֵמָּה אֶתְכֶם חֲזוֹן לִבָּם ידברו לא מפי יהוה	אל תשמעו לְדברי[c] הנבאים Deest כִּי מהבלים לָהֶם חָזוֹן מִלִּבָּם ידברו וְלא מפי יהוה
17	אמרים אָמוֹר לִמְנַאֲצַי דִּבֶּר יהוה וְכֹל הֹלֵךְ בִּשְׁרִרוּת לִבּוֹ לֹא־תָבוֹא עֲלֵיכֶם	אמרים[d] לִמְנַאֲצַי דְּבַר יהוה וּלְכֹל הַהֹלְכִים בְּחֶפְצֵיהֶם וּלְכֹל הֹלֵךְ בְּתָעוּת לִבּוֹ לֹא־תָבוֹא עָלֶיךָ
18	וְיֵרֶא וְיִשְׁמַע אֶת־דברו מִי־ הִקְשִׁיב דְּבָרוֹ וישמע	וַיַּרְא אֶת־דברו מִי־הִקְשִׁיב וישמע
19	סַעֲרַת יהוה חמה יצאה וְסַעַר מתחולל עַל־רֹאשׁ רְשָׁעִים יָחוּל	סְעָרָה מֵאֵת יהוה[e] וְחֵמָה יצאה לְסַעַר מתחולל עַל־הָרְשָׁעִים יָבֹא
20	לֹא יָשׁוּב מְזִמּוֹת לִבּוֹ תִּתְבּוֹנְנוּ בָהּ בִּינָה	וְלֹא עוֹד יָשׁוּב (יָשׁוּב עוֹד) מְזִמַּת[f] לִבּוֹ יִתְבּוֹנְנוּ בָהּ
22	וְיַשְׁמִעוּ דברי אֶת־עַמִּי וִישִׁבוּם מִדַּרְכָּם הָרָע וּמֵרֹעַ מַעַלְלֵיהֶם	וְאִם יִשְׁמְעוּ (וְשָׁמְעוּ) דברי וְאֶת־עַמִּי יְשִׁבוּם מֵרֹעַ מַעַלְלֵיהֶם
23	הַאֱלֹהֵי מִקָּרֹב אָנִי וְלֹא אֱלֹהֵי מֵרָחֹק	אֱלֹהִים קָרוֹב אֲנִי[g] וְלֹא אֱלֹהִים מֵרָחוֹק
24	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	Deest
25	אֵת אֲשֶׁר־אָמְרוּ הנבאים הַנִּבְּאִים חלמתי חָלָמְתִּי	אֵת אֲשֶׁר אֹמְרִים[h] הנבאים אֲשֶׁר־נִבְּאִים חלמתי חֲלוֹם[i]
26	עַד־מָתַי הֲיֵשׁ	עַד־מָתַי יֵשׁ[k] (יִהְיֶה)

[a] Targ. זַנָּאִין וּמְהַלְּכִין בִּשְׁקַר וּמַתְקְפִין . . . בְּדִיל דְּלָא לְמָתַב. [b] Vid. 9:14. [c] Targ. לְפִתְגָמֵי. [d] Targ. אָמְרִין. [e] Targ. מִן קֳדָם יְיָ. [f] Targ. מַחְשְׁבַת. [g] Targ. אֲנָא אֱלָהָא בְּרֵית עָלְמָא מִבְּרֵאשִׁית. [h] Targ. יָת דְּאָמְרִין. [i] Targ. פִּתְגַם נְבוּאָה בְּחֶלְמָא אִתְחֲזִא לִי. [k] Targ. עַד אֵימָתַי אִית.

	נבאי הַשקר וּנְבִאֵי תַּרְמִת לבם	נבאי שקר בְּנִבְּאָם[a] חֲפַצִי (תַּרְמִת[b]?) לבם
27	לְהַשְׁכִּיחַ את־עַמִּי שְׁמִי	לִשְׁכֹּחַ את־תּוֹרָתִי
28	אשר־אתו חלום יספר חלום	אשר־אתו הַחלום יספר חלומו
	יְדַבֵּר דברי	יְסַפֵּר דברי
	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	Deest
29	הלוא כה דְבָרִי כאש נאם־יהוה	כה דְבָרַי[c] נאם־יהוה הלא הִנֵּה דְבָרַי כאש נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה
30	לכן הנני עַל־הנביאים נאם־יְהוָֹה	הנני לכן אֶל־הנביאים נאם־אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה
31	הנני עַל־הנביאים נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה הַלֹּקְחִים לשונם וַיִּנְאֲמוּ נְאֻם	הנני אֶל־הנביאים הַשֹּׁלְחִים לשון נְבוּאָה[d] (נְבוּאוֹת לָשׁוֹן) וַיָּנוּמוּ נוּם
32	הנני עַל־נִבְּאֵי חלמות שקר נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה וַיספרום	לָכֵן הנני אֶל־הַנִּבְּאִים הַמִּתְנַבְּאִים חלמות שקר וְלֹא יספרום
	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	Deest
33	וְכִי־יִשְׁאָלְךָ	וכי ישְׁאֲלוּ
	אוֹ־הַנָּבִיא אוֹ־כֹהֵן לֵאמֹר	או־כהן או־נביא
	אֶת־מַה־מַּשָּׂא	אַתֶּם[e] הַמַּשָּׂא
34	וְהַנָּבִיא וְהַכֹּהֵן	הנביא והכֹּהֲנִים
	אשר יֹאמַר	אשר יֹאמְרוּ
	ופקדתי עַל־האיש ההוא וְעַל־ביתו	ופקדתי אֶת־האיש ההוא וּביתו
35	איש עַל־רעהו	איש אֶל־רעהו[f]
36	המשא יהיה לְאיש דברו	המשא לְאיש יהיה דברו
	וַהֲפַכְתֶּם אֶת־דִּבְרֵי אֱלֹהִים חַיִּים יְהוָֹה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵינוּ׃	Desunt
37	כֹּה תֹאמַר אֶל־הַנָּבִיא מֶה־עָנְךָ יְהוָֹה	
	וּמַה־דִּבֶּר יהוה	וְעַל־מָה דבר יהוה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
38	וְאִם־מַשָּׂא יְהוָֹה תֹּאמֵרוּ לכן כה אמר יהוה	לכן כה אמר יהוה אֱלֹהֵינוּ

[a] Targ. דְמִתְנַבַּן. [b] Vid. 14:14. [c] Targ. פִּתְגָּמַי. [d] Targ. דְמִתְנַבַּן.
[e] Raschi: אומרים לכם מה המשא, אתם למשא לחקב״ה וכו׳. [f] Targ. גְּבַר לְחַבְרֵיהּ.

39	הנני וְנָשִׁיתִי אֶתְכֶם נָשֹׁא ונטשתי מֵעַל־פָּנָי	הנני נֹשֵׂא (לֹקֵחַ) ונטשתי Deest

CAPUT XXIV.

1	הראני יהוה וְהִנֵּה שני	הראני יהוה שני
	ואת־שָׂרֵי יְהוּדָה ואת־החרש ואת־המסגר	ואת־הַשָּׂרִים ואת־החרשים ואת־המסגרים[a] וְאֶת־הָעֲשִׁירִים
2	הדוד אחד	הדוד הָאחד
	והדוד אֶחָד	והדוד הָאַחֵר
	אשר לא־תאכלנה מרע	אשר לא־תאכלנה מרעָן
3	אשר לא־תאכלנה מרע	אשר לא־תאכלנה מרעָן
6	ושמתי עיני עליהם	ושמתי עינַי עליהם
	על־הארץ הזאת	אֶל־הארץ[b] הזאת לְטוֹבָה
	ולא אֶהֱרֹס	ולא אֶהֶרְסֵם
7	לָדַעַת אתי	לְדַעְתָּם אתי
8	אשר לא־תאכלנה מרע כִּי־כֹה אמר יהוה	אשר לא־תאכלנה מרעָן כה אמר יהוה
	ואת־שָׂרָיו	ואת־גְּדוֹלָיו[c]
	בְּאֶרֶץ מצרים	במצרים
9	ונתתים לזַוְעָה לְרָעָה	ונתתים לזְוָעָה[d] (לְזָרוֹה)
	להרפה	וְיִהְיוּ להרפה
	לִשְׁנִינָה	לִשְׂנְאָה
	בכל־הַמְּקֹמוֹת אשר־אַדִּיחֵם שם	בכל־הַמָּקוֹם אשר־הִדַּחְתִּים[e] שם
10	את־הַחֶרֶב את־הרעב ואת־הַדָּבֶר	את־הרעב ואת־הַדֶּבֶר ואת־הַחֶרֶב
	אשר־נתתי לחם וְלַאֲבוֹתֵיהֶם	אשר־נתתי להם

---

[a] Targ. וְיַת אִמָּנַיָּא וְיַת תָּרְעַיָּא. [b] Targ. לְאַרְעָא. [c] Targ. רַבְרְבוֹהִי.
[d] Vid. 34:17. [e] ut 8:3.

CAPUT XXV.

1	עַל־ירמיהו	אֶל־ירמיהו
	הִיא הַשָּׁנָה הָרִאשֹׁנִית לִנְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל	Desunt
2	אשר דבר יִרְמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא עַל־ כל־עם יהודה ואל כָּל־ישבי ירושלם	אשר דבר אֶל־כל־עם יהודה ואל־ ישבי ירושלם
3	מִן־שלש עשרה שנה	בִּשלש עשרה שנה
	בן־אמון	בן־אמֹץ[a] (אמוץ)
	זֶה שלש ועשרים שנה	שלש ועשרים שנה
	הָיָה דְבַר־יְהוָה אֵלַי	Deest
	אַשְׁכִּים ודבר וְלֹא שְׁמַעְתֶּם	הַשכים ודבר
4	וְשָׁלַח יְהוָה אליכם את־כָּל־עבדיו הנבאים השכם וְשלח	וָאֶשְׁלַח אליכם את־עבדַי[b] הנבאים השכם שלח
	ולא־הִטִּיתֶם אֶת־אזנכם לִשְׁמֹעַ	ולא־הִקְשַׁבְתֶּם בְּאזנֵיכם
5	שובו־נָא איש מדרכו	שבו איש מדרכו
	וּשְׁבוּ על־האדמה	וְתֵשְׁבוּ על־האדמה
	נתן יְהוָה לכם	נתתִּי לכם
6	וְאַל־תלכו	אל־תלכו
	במעשה ידיכם וְלֹא אָרַע לכם	במעשי ידיכם לְהָרַע לכם
7	נְאֻם־יְהוָה לְמַעַן הַכְעִסוּנִי בְּמַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵיכֶם לְרַע לָכֶם	Desunt
8	יהוה צְבָאוֹת	יהוה
	לֹא־שְׁמַעְתֶּם אֶת־דברי	לֹא־הֶאֱמַנְתֶּם לִדברי
9	אֶת־כָּל־משפחות צפון נְאֻם־יְהוָה	משפַּחַת צפון (משפָּחָה מִצָּפון)
	וְאֶל־נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל עַבְדִּי	Deest
	כל־הגוים הָאֵלֶּה סביב	כל־הגוים סביב לָהּ
	ולְחָרְבוֹת עולם	ולְחֶרְפַּת עולם[c]
10	קול ששון וקול שמחה	קול שמחה וקול ששון
	קול רֵחַיִם	רֵיחַ מוֹר
11	הארץ הַזֹּאת לְחָרְבָּה לשמה	הארץ לשמה
	ועבדו הַגוים הָאֵלֶּה אֶת־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל	ועבדו בַגוים

[a] Vid. 1:2. [b] Cf. 35:15. [c] Cf. 23:40.

12	וְהָיָה כמלאות שבעים שנה אפקד עַל־מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל וְעַל־ הגוי ההוא	וּכְמלאות (וּבמלאות) שבעים הַשנה אפקד אֶת־הגוי ההוא
	נְאֻם־יְהוָה אֶת־עֲוֹנָם וְעַל־אֶרֶץ כַּשְׂדִּים	Deest
	ושמתי אתו לשממות עולם	ושמתי אֹתָם לשמַמֹת[a] עלם
13	על־כָּל־הגוים	על־הגוים
14	כִּי עָבְדוּ־בָם גַּם־הֵמָּה גּוֹיִם רַבִּים וּמְלָכִים גְּדוֹלִים וְשִׁלַּמְתִּי לָהֶם כְּפָעֳלָם וּכְמַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵיהֶם	Desunt
15	כִּי כה אמר יהוה אלהי ישראל אֵלַי קח את־כוס היין הַחֵמָה הזֹּאת מידי והשקיתה אֹתוֹ את־כל־הגוים	כה אמר יהוה אלהי ישראל קח את־כוס היין הֶחָמֵר הַזֶּה[b] מידי והשקיתה את־כל־הגוים
16	וְהִתְגֹּעֲשׁוּ	וְקָאוּ[c]
17	את־כָּל־הגוים	את־הגוים
18	ואת־מְלָכֶיהָ את־שריה לשמה לשרקה וְלִקְלָלָה כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה	ואת־מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה וְאת־שריה לשמה וְלשרקה
19	את־פרעה ואת־שָׂרָיו ואת־כל־עמו	וְאת־פרעה ואת־גְּדֹלָיו: ואת[d]־כל־עמו
20	וְאֵת כָּל־מַלְכֵי אֶרֶץ הָעוּץ	Deest
	כל־מלכי אֶרֶץ פלשתים	כל־מלכי פלשתים
21	את־אדום	וְאת־אדום
22	ואת כָּל־מלכי צר ואת כָּל־מלכי צידון ואת מַלְכֵי הָאִי אשר בעבר הים	ואת מלכי צר ואת מלכי צידון ואת הַמְּלָכִים אשר בעבר הים
23	את־דדן ואת־בּוּז	וְאת־דדן ואת־רוֹז[e]
24	וְאֵת כָּל־מַלְכֵי עֲרָב ואת כל־מַלְכֵי הערב	ואת כל־הערב
25	וְאֵת כָּל־מַלְכֵי זִמְרִי	Deest
	ואת כל־מלכי מָדָי	ואת כל־מלכי פָּרָס

[a] Targ. לְצָדוּת. [b] ut Ps. 75:9 (Gk. & Heb.). [c] Cf. vs. 27. [d] Inc. vs. 20. [e] 'Ρῶς.—Cf. Judges 5:23.

26	כל־מלכי הצָּפוֹן הקרבים והרחקים	כל־מלכי הקֶּדֶם הרחקים והקרבים[a]
	ואת כל־הממְלָכות הָאָרֶץ	ואת כל־הממְלָכות
	וּמֶלֶךְ שֵׁשַׁךְ יִשְׁתֶּה אַחֲרֵיהֶם	Deest
27	כה־אמר יהוה צבאות אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁתוּ וְשִׁכְרוּ וּקְיוּ וְנִפְלוּ	כה־אמר יהוה צבאות תִּשְׁתּוּ תִּשְׁכְּרוּ וְתָקִיאוּ וְתִפְּלוּ
28	ואמרת אֲלֵיהֶם	ואמרת
	יהוה צְבָאוֹת	יהוה
29	כי הִנֵּה בעיר אשר־נקרא שמי עליה אנכי מחל להרע ואתם הנקה תִנָּקוּ לא תנקו	כי בעיר בַּאשר־נקרא שמי עליה אנכי מחל להרע ואתם הנקה לֹא תנקו
	על־כל־ישְׁבֵי הארץ	על־כל־הַיֹּשְׁבִים עַל־הארץ
	נְאֻם יְהוָֹה צְבָאוֹת	Deest
30	ואתה תנבא אֲליהם את כָּל־הדברים האלה ואמרת אֲלֵיהֶם יהוה ממרום יִשְׁאָג וּמִמְּעוֹן קדשו יתן קולו שָׁאֹג יִשְׁאַג על־נָוֵהוּ הֵידָד כדרכים יענֶה אֶל כָּל־ישבי הארץ:	ואתה תנבא עֲליהם את־הדברים האלה ואמרת יהוה ממרום יְדַבֵּר מִקדשו (מִמְּקְדָשׁוֹ) יתן קולו דָּבָר יְדַבֵּר על־מְקוֹמוֹ וְהַמָּה (הידד) כדרכים יענוּ וְעַל־ישבי הארץ יָבֹא שאון:
31	בָּא שאון עַד־קצה הארץ	עַל[b]־קצה הארץ
	כִּשְׁפָּט הוא לכל־בשר הרשעים נְתָנָם לחרב	שֹׁפֵט הוא לכל־בשר וְהרשעים נִתְּנוּ לחרב
32	יהוה צְבָאוֹת	יהוה
	רעה יצאת מגוי אֶל־גוי וסער גדול יעוֹר	רעה יצאת מגוי עַל־גוי וסער גדול יֵצֵא[c]
33	והיו חללי יהוה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא מקצֵה הארץ	והיו חללי יהוה בְּיוֹם יְהוָֹה מקצוֹת[d] הארץ
	לֹא יִסָּפְדוּ וְלֹא יֵאָסְפוּ וְלֹא יקברו	לא יקברו
34	הילילו הָרֹעִים	הילילו רֹעִים
	והתפַּלְּשׁוּ	והתגֹּדְדוּ
	וּתְפוֹצוֹתִיכֶם	Deest
	כִּכְלִי חמדה	כְּכָרֵי (כְּאֵילֵי) חמדה

[a] Cf. 48:24. [b] Inc. vs. 31. [c] *ἐκπορεύεται.* [d] Targ. כִּסְיָפֵי.

36	מֵאדירֵי הצאן	הצאן וְהָאדירִים
	כי־שֹׁדֵד יהוה	כי־שָׁדַד יהוה
37	ונדמו נְאוֹת השלום מפני חרון אַף־יְהוָֹה	ונדמו שְׁאֵרִית (יֶתֶר) השלום מפני חרון אַפִּי
38	סְכּוֹ	יִתְרוֹ (שְׁאֵרִיתוֹ, סֹפוֹ)
	מפני חֲרוֹן הַיּוֹנָה וּמִפְּנֵי חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ	מפני הַחֶרֶב[a] הַגְּדוֹלָה[b]

CAPUT XXVI.

1	מַמְלְכוּת יהויקים	מֶלֶךְ (מְלֹךְ?) יהויקים
	מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה	Deest
	מאת יהוה לֵאמֹר	מאת יהוה
2	ודברת עַל־כָּל־עָרֵי יְהוּדָה הבאים להשתחות בית־יהוה	ודברת אֶל־כָּל־הַיְּהוּדִים (עַם־יְהוּדָה?) וּלְכָל־הבאים להשתחות בְּבֵית[c]־יהוה
3	וְנִחַמְתִּי אֶל־הרעה	וְחָדַלְתִּי מִן־הרעה[d]
4	ואמרת אֲלֵיהֶם	ואמרת
	ללכת בְּתוֹרָתִי	ללכת בתוֹרֹתַי
5	לשמע עַל־דברי	לשמע אֶל־דברי[e]
	וְהשכם וְשָׁלֹחַ ולא שמעתם	השכם[f] וָאֶשְׁלַח ולא שמעתם אֵלָי
6	הַזֹּאתָה	Deest
	גויי הארץ	גויי כָּל־הארץ
7	וְהַנְּבִיאִים	וּנְבִיאֵי הַשֶּׁקֶר
8	כל־אשר־צוה יהוה	כל־אשר־צוה יהוה אוֹתוֹ
	וְהַנְּבִיאִים	וּנְבִיאֵי הַשֶּׁקֶר
9	מַדּוּעַ נבית	כִּי נבית
	מֵאֵין יוֹשֵׁב	מִיּוֹשְׁבִים (מִיּוֹשֵׁב)
	אֶל־ירמיהו	עַל־ירמיהו[g]
10	הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה	הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה
	בְּפֶתַח שַׁעַר־יְהוָֹה החדש	בְּפִתְחֵי שער החדש
11	וְהַנְּבִיאִים	וּנְבִיאֵי הַשֶּׁקֶר

[a] Targ. מִן קֳדָם חָרֵב. [b] Vid. 46:16; 50:16. Cf. Isa. 27:1. [c] Targ. בְּבֵית.
[d] Targ. וַאֲתִיב מִן בִּישְׁתָא. [e] Targ. לְפִתְגָמַי. [f] Targ. בְּקַדָּם. [g] Targ. עַל יִרְמְיָהוּ.

Verse		
	לֵאמֹר	Deest
	כי נבא אֶל־העיר הזאת	כי נבא עַל־העיר[a] הזאת
12	אל־כָּל־השרים	אל־השרים
	אֶל־הבית הזה ואֶל־העיר הזאת	עַל[b]־הבית הזה וְעַל[c]־העיר הזאת
13	אֱלֹהֵיכֶם	Deest
	וִינָּחֵם יהוה אֶל־הרעה	וְיֶחֱדַל יהוה מִן־הרעה[d]
14	וַאֲנִי הנני בְיֶדְכֶם	וְהנני בִידֵיכם
	כטוב וכישר בְּעֵינֵיכם	כישר וכטוב לָכם
15	כִּי־דם נקי	דם נקי
	ואֶל־העיר הזאת ואֶל־יושבֶיהָ	וְעַל[e]־העיר הזאת וְעַל[f]־הַיושבִים בָּהּ
	שלחני יהוה עֲליכם	שלחני יהוה אֲליכם
16	ואל־הַנּבִיאִים	ואל־נביאֵי הַשָּׁקֶר
17	לֵאמֹר	Deest
18	היה נִבָּא בימי חזקיהו	היה בימי חזקיהו
	לֵאמֹר	Deest
	כה־אמר יהוה צְבָאוֹת ציון שדה תחרש וירושלים עִיִּים תהיה	כה־אמר יהוה ציון כַּשדה תחרש וירושלים לְשַׁמָּה תהיה
19	ההמת המתהו	ההמת המתהו
	מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה	Deest
	הלא יָרֵא את־יהוה וַיְחַל	הכי לא יראו את־יהוה וְכִי־לא חִלּוּ
	וַיִּנָּחֶם יהוה אֶל־הרעה	וַיֶּחְדַל יהוה מִן־הרעה[g]
	ואנחנו עֹשים	ואנחנו עָשינו
20	וגם־איש היה	ואיש היה
	עַל־הָעִיר הַזֹּאת וְעַל־הארץ הזאת	על־הארץ הזאת
21	וְכָל־גִּבּוֹרָיו	Deest
	את־דבריו ויבקש הַמֶּלֶךְ המיתו	את־כָּל־דבריו ויבקשו המיתו
	וַיִּרָא וַיִּבְרַח ויבא מצרים	ויבא אֶל־מצרים[h]
22	וישלח המלך יְהוֹיָקִים אנשים מצרים	וישלח המלך אנשים אֶל־מצרים[i]

[a] Targ. עַל קַרְתָּא. [b] Targ. עַל. [c] Targ. וְעַל. [d] Targ. וִיתוּב יְיָ מִן בִּישְׁתָא. [e] Targ. וְעַל. [f] Targ. וְעַל. [g] Targ. וְתָב יְיָ מִן בִּישְׁתָא. [h] Targ. לְמִצְרָיִם. [i] Targ. לְמִצְרָיִם.

	אֶת־אֶלְנָתָן בֶּן־עַכְבּוֹר וַאֲנָשִׁים אִתּוֹ אֶל־מִצְרָיִם	Desunt
23	וַיּוֹצִיאוּ אֶת־אוּרִיָּהוּ מִמִּצְרַיִם אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ יְהוֹיָקִים	ויוציאו אוֹתוֹ מִשָּׁם אל־המלך
	וישלך אֶת־נִבְלָתוֹ אל־קִבְרֵי בני הָעָם	וישלך אותו אל־קֶבֶר[a] בני עַמּוֹ
24	בְּיַד־העם	בְּיַד־העם

CAPUT XXVII.

1	בְּרֵאשִׁית מַמְלֶכֶת יְהוֹיָקִם בֶּן־יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה הָיָה הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה אֶל־יִרְמְיָה מֵאֵת יְהוָֹה לֵאמֹר׃	Desunt
2	כה־אמר יהוה אֵלַי	כה־אמר יהוה
	וּנְתַתָּם על־צוארך	וְנָתַתָּ על־צוארך
3	בְּיַד מלאָכִים הבאים ירושלם	בְּיַדֵי מלאֲכֵיהֶם הבאים לִקְרָאתָם ירושלם
4	כה־אמר יהוה צְבָאוֹת	כה־אמר יהוה
5	אנכי עשיתי	כִּי אנכי עשיתי
	אֶת־הָאָדָם וְאֶת־הַבְּהֵמָה אֲשֶׁר עַל־פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ	Desunt
6	וְעַתָּה אָנֹכִי נתתי את־כָּל־הָאֲרָצוֹת הָאֵלֶּה בְּיַד נבוכדנאצר מלך־בבל עַבְדִּי וְגַם את־חַיַּת השדה נָתַתִּי לוֹ לעבדו׃	נתתי את־הָאָרֶץ לִנבוכדנאצר מלך בבל לְעָבְדוֹ וְאת־חַיּוֹת השדה לעבדו׃
7	וְעָבְדוּ אֹתוֹ כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם וְאֶת־בְּנוֹ וְאֶת־בֶּן־בְּנוֹ עַד בֹּא־עֵת אַרְצוֹ גַּם־הוּא וְעָבְדוּ בוֹ גּוֹיִם רַבִּים וּמְלָכִים גְּדוֹלִים׃	Desunt
8	וְהָיָה הגוי והממלכה אֲשֶׁר לֹא־	וְהגוי והממלכה אשר לא־

---

[a] εἰς τὸ μνῆμα.

	יַעַבְדוּ אֹתוֹ אֶת־נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל וְאֵת אשר לא־יִתֵּן את־צוארוֹ בעל מלך בבל	יִתְּנוּ את־צוארָם בעל מלך בבל
	וּבַדֶּבֶר	Deest
	עַל־הַגּוֹי הַהוּא	עֲלֵיהֶם
	עד־תֻּמִּי אֹתָם	עד־תֻּמָּם[a]
9	נביאיכם ואל־קסמיכם ואל־חֲלֹמֹתֵיכֶם ואל־עֹנְנֵיכם	נביאיכם הַשֶּׁקֶר[b] ואל־הַקֹּסְמִים לָכֶם ואל־הַחֹלְמִים לָכֶם ואל מְנַחֲשֵׁיכם[c]
	אֲשֶׁר־הֵם אמרים אֲלֵיכֶם לֵאמֹר	הָאֹמְרִים
	וְהִדַּחְתִּי אֶתְכֶם וַאֲבַדְתֶּם	Deest
11	נְאֻם־יְהוָה ועבדהּ	ועבדוֹ (ועבדה)
12	הביאו את־צואריכם בְּעֹל מלך בבל ועבדו אתו וְעַמּוֹ וִחְיוּ	הביאו את־צוארְכם ועבדו אֶת־מלך בבל
13	לָמָּה תָמוּתוּ אַתָּה וְעַמֶּךָ בַּחֶרֶב בָּרָעָב וּבַדֶּבֶר כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֶל־הַגּוֹי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יַעֲבֹד אֶת־	Desunt
14	מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל׃ וְאַל־תִּשְׁמְעוּ אֶל־דִּבְרֵי הַנְּבִאִים הָאֹמְרִים אֲלֵיכֶם לֵאמֹר לֹא תַעַבְדוּ אֶת־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל	
15	והם נבאים בשמי לַשֶּׁקֶר למען הדיחִי	והם נִבְּאִים בשמי עַל־שקר למען הדיחֲ[d]
	וְהַנְּבִאִים הנבאים לכם	וּנביאֵיכֶם הנבאים לכם עַל־שֶׁקֶר כְּזָבִים
16	ואל־הכהנים ואל־כל־העם הזה אל־דברי נביאֵיכֶם	לָכֶם ואל־כל־העם הזה ואל־הכהנים אל־דברי הַנְּבִיאִים
	עַתָּה מְהֵרָה	Deest
17	אַל־תִּשְׁמְעוּ אֲלֵיהֶם עִבְדוּ אֶת־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל וִחְיוּ לָמָּה תִהְיֶה הָעִיר הַזֹּאת חָרְבָּה׃	לֹא שְׁלַחְתִּים
18	יִפְגְּעוּ־נָא בַיהוָה צְבָאוֹת לְבִלְתִּי־בֹאוּ הַכֵּלִים הַנּוֹתָרִים בְּבֵית־יְהוָה וּבֵית מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה וּבִירוּשָׁלִַם בָּבֶלָה׃	יפגעו־בִי

[a] ut 24:10. [b] Targ. נְבִיֵּיכוֹן דְּשִׁקְרָא. [c] Cf. Gen. 44:5. [d] Cf. vs. 10.
[e] ut 28:15.

19	כי כה אמר יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֶל־ הָעַמֻּדִים וְעַל־הַיָּם וְעַל־ הַמְּכֹנוֹת ועל יתר הכלים הַנּוֹתָרִים בָּעִיר הַזֹּאת׃	כי כה אמר יהוה ועל יתר הכלים
20	אשר לא־לְקָחָם נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר מלך בבל בגלותו את־יכוֹניה בֶּן־ יְהוֹיָקִים מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה מירושלם בָּבֶלָה וְאֵת כָּל־חֹרֵי יְהוּדָה וִירוּשָׁלָם׃	אשר לא־לָקַח מלך בבל בגלות את־ יכוניה מירושלם
21	כִּי כֹה־אָמַר יְהוָֹה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל־הַכֵּלִים הַנּוֹתָרִים בֵּית יְהוָֹה וּבֵית מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה וִירוּשָׁלָם׃	Desunt
22	וְשָׁמָּה יִהְיוּ עַד יוֹם פָּקְדִי אֹתָם וְהַעֲלִיתִים וַהֲשִׁבֹתִים אֶל־ הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה	

CAPUT XXVIII.

1	ויהי בַּשָּׁנָה הַהִיא בְּרֵאשִׁית מַמְלֶכֶת צדקיה מלך־יהודה בשנת הרביעית	ויהי בשנה הרביעית לְצדקיה מלך־ יהודה
	הנביא אֲשֶׁר מגבעון	הנביא הַשֶּׁקֶר[a] מגבעון
2	יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר	יהוה
3	אני משיב	וַאני משיב
	את־כָּל־כלי בית יהוה	את־כלי בית יהוה
	אֲשֶׁר לָקַח נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל מִן־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה וַיְבִיאֵם בָּבֶל	Desunt
4	ואת־יכניה בֶּן־יְהוֹיָקִים מֶלֶךְ־ יְהוּדָה ואת־כָּל־גלות יהודה	ואת־יכניה ואת־גלות יהודה

[a] Targ. נְבִיָּא שִׁקְרָא.

	הַבָּאִים בָּבֶלָה אֲנִי מֵשִׁיב אֶל־ הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	Desunt
5	ויאמר ירמיה הַנָּבִיא אל־חנניה הַנָּבִיא לעיני הכהנים ולעיני כל־העם	ויאמר ירמיהו אל־חנניה לעיני כל־ העם ולעיני הכהנים
6	ויאמר ירמיה הַנָּבִיא	ויאמר ירמיה
	יקם יְהוָֹה את־דברֶיך	יקם את־דברְךָ[a]
7	שְׁמַע־נָא הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה	שִׁמְעוּ דְבַר־יְהוָֹה
	באזנֶיךָ	באזנֵיכֶם
8	וּלְפָנֶיךָ	וְלִפְנֵיכֶם
	אֶל־אֲרָצוֹת רבות	עַל[b]־אֶרֶץ רבה
	למלחמה וּלְרָעָה וּלְדָבֶר	למלחמה
9	הנביא אֲשֶׁר יִנָּבֵא לשלום בבא דְּבַר הַנָּבִיא יִוָּדַע הנביא אשר־שְׁלָחוֹ יהוה באמת	הנביא הַמִּתְנַבֵּא לשלום בבא הַדָּבָר יֵדְעוּ הנביא אשר שָׁלַח אֲלֵיהֶם יהוה באמת
10	ויקח חנניה הַנָּבִיא את־המוטָה מעל צואר ירמיה הַנָּבִיא וישברהו׃	ויקח חנניה בְּעֵינֵי כָל־הָעָם את־המוטות מעל צואר ירמיה וישברן
11	נְבֻכַדְנֶאצַּר בְּעוֹד שְׁנָתַיִם יָמִים	Desunt
	מעל צַוַּאר כל־הגוים	מעל צַוְּארֵי כל־הגוים
	ירמיה הַנָּבִיא	ירמיה
12	אחרי שבור חנניה הַנָּבִיא את־ המוטָה מעל צַוַּאר יִרְמְיָה הַנָּבִיא	אחרי שבור חנניה את־המוטות מעל צַוָּארוֹ
13	ועשיתָ	ועשיתִי (וְאֶעֱשֶׂה)
14	יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה
	נתתי על־צואר כל־הגוים הָאֵלֶּה לעבד את־נְבֻכַדְנֶאצַּר מלך־בבל	נתתי על־צואר כל־הגוים לעבד את־מלך בבל
	וַעֲבָדֻהוּ וְגַם אֶת־חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה נָתַתִּי לוֹ	Desunt
15	ויאמר ירמיה הַנָּבִיא אל־חנניה הַנָּבִיא	ויאמר ירמיה אל־חנניה

[a] Targ. פִּתְגָמָךְ. [b] Targ. עַל.

	שְׁמַע־נָא חֲנַנְיָה	Deest
	וְאַתָּה הבטחת את־העם הזה	והבטחת את־העם הזה
16	הַשנה אתה מת	בַּשנה הַזֹּאת[a] אתה מת
	כִּי־סָרָה דִבַּרְתָּ אֶל־יְהוָֹה	Deest
17	וימת חֲנַנְיָה הַנָּבִיא בַּשָּׁנָה הַהִיא בחדש השביעי	וימת בחדש השביעי

CAPUT XXIX.

1	ירמיה הַנָּבִיא	ירמיה
	אל־יֶתֶר זקני הגולה	אל־זקני הגולה
	ואל־הַנְּבִיאִים	ואל־נביאֵי הַשֶּׁקֶר סֵפֶר בָּבֶלָה אֶל־הַגּוֹלָה
	אֲשֶׁר הֶגְלָה נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר מִירוּשָׁלַםִ בָּבֶלָה	Desunt
2	שָׂרֵי יְהוּדָה וִירוּשָׁלַםִ והחרש והמסגר	וְכָל־חֹר[b] (הַחוֹרִים) והמסגר והחרש
3	אל־נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר מלך בבל	אל־מלך בבל
4	יהוה צְבָאוֹת	יהוה
	לְכָל־הגולה	עַל־הגולה
	מירושלם בָּבֶלָה	מירושלם
6	קחו נשים	וּקחו נשים
	וְתֵלַדְנָה בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת ורבו־שָׁם	ורבו
7	ודרשו אֶת־שלום הָעִיר	ודרשו לְשלום הָאָרֶץ
	והתפללו בעדָהּ	והתפללו בעדָם
	יִהְיֶה לכם שלום	שלום לכם
8	כי כה אמר יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אל־ישיאו לכם נביאיכֶם אשר בקרבכם וְקסמיכם	כי כה אמר יהוה אל־ישיאו לכם נביאי הַשֶּׁקֶר[c] אשר בקרבכם וְאַל־יַשִּׁיאוּ לָכֶם קסמיכם
9	כי בְשקר	כי שקר (שְׁקָרִים)

[a] Targ. בְּשַׁתָּא הָדָא. [b] ἐλευθέρου. [c] Targ. דְּשִׁקְרָא.

	לא שלחתים נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	וְלֹא שלחתים
10	כי לְפִי מלאת והקמתי עליכם את־דבְרִי הַטּוֹב להשיב אֶתְכם	כי בִּמלאת (לְמלאת) והקמתי את־דבָרַי עליכם להשיב עִמְּכם
11	כִּי אָנֹכִי יָדַעְתִּי אֶת־הַמַּחֲשָׁבוֹת אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי חֹשֵׁב עליכם נְאֻם־ יְהוָֹה מחשְׁבוֹת שלום ולא לְרָעָה לתת לכם אַחֲרִית וְתִקְוָה	וָאֶחְשֹׁב עליכם מחֹשֶׁבֶת שלום[a] ולא רעוֹת לתת לכם אֵלֶּה
12	וּקְרָאתֶם אֹתִי וַהֲלַכְתֶּם	Deest
13	ומצאתם	ומצאתם אֹתִי
14	ונִמְצֵאתִי לכם	ונִגְלֵיתִי (ונִרְאֵיתִי) לכם
	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה וְשַׁבְתִּי אֶת־שְׁבִיתְכֶם וְקִבַּצְתִּי אֶתְכֶם מִכָּל־הַגּוֹיִם וּמִכָּל־הַמְּקוֹמוֹת אֲשֶׁר הִדַּחְתִּי אֶתְכֶם שָׁם נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה וַהֲשִׁבֹתִי אֶתְכֶם אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר־הִגְלֵיתִי אֶתְכֶם מִשָּׁם׃	Desunt
16	כִּי־כֹה אָמַר יְהוָֹה אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ הַיּוֹשֵׁב אֶל־כִּסֵּא דָוִד וְאֶל־כָּל־ הָעָם הַיּוֹשֵׁב בָּעִיר הַזֹּאת אֲחֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָצְאוּ אִתְּכֶם בַּגּוֹלָה׃	
17	כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָֹה צְבָאוֹת הִנְנִי מְשַׁלֵּחַ בָּם אֶת־הַחֶרֶב אֶת־הָרָעָב וְאֶת־הַדָּבֶר וְנָתַתִּי אוֹתָם כַּתְּאֵנִים הַשֹּׁעָרִים אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תֵאָכַלְנָה מֵרֹעַ׃	
18	וְרָדַפְתִּי אַחֲרֵיהֶם בַּחֶרֶב בָּרָעָב וּבַדָּבֶר וּנְתַתִּים לְזַוְעָה לְכֹל מַמְלְכוֹת הָאָרֶץ לְאָלָה וּלְשַׁמָּה וְלִשְׁרֵקָה וּלְחֶרְפָּה בְּכָל־הַגּוֹיִם	
19	אֲשֶׁר־הִדַּחְתִּים שָׁם׃ תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר לֹא־שָׁמְעוּ אֶל־דְּבָרַי נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה אֲשֶׁר שָׁלַחְתִּי אֲלֵיהֶם אֶת־עֲבָדַי	

[a] Targ. מַחְשְׁבַת שְׁלָמָא.

	הַנְּבִיאִים הַשְׁכֵּם וְשָׁלֹחַ וְלֹא	Desunt
20	שְׁמַעְתֶּם נְאֻם־יְהוָה׃ וְאַתֶּם שִׁמְעוּ דְבַר־יְהוָה כָּל־הַגּוֹלָה אֲשֶׁר־שִׁלַּחְתִּי מִירוּשָׁלַםִ בָּבֶלָה׃	Desunt
21	צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־אחאב בֶּן־קוֹלָיָה וְאֶל־צדקיהו בֶן־מַעֲשֵׂיָה הַנִּבְּאִים לָכֶם בִּשְׁמִי שָׁקֶר	עַל[a]־אחאב וְעַל[b]־צדקיהו
	בְּיַד נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מלך־בבל	בִּידֵי מלך־בבל
22	וְלֻקַּח מהם קללה לְכֹל גלות יהודה אֲשֶׁר בבבל	וִיקְחוּ מהם קללה בְּכל גלות יהודה בבבל
	כְּצדקיהו וכאחב אשר־קלם מלך־בבל באש	כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לְצדקיהו וכאחב אשר מלך־בבל קלה באש
23	וַיְדַבְּרו דבר בשמי שָׁקֶר	וְדבר דִּברו בשמי
	ואנכי הַוֹּיָדֵע וָעֵד	ואנכי עד
24	לֵאמֹר	Deest
25	כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר יַעַן אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה שָׁלַחְתָּ בְשִׁמְכָה סְפָרִים אֶל־כָּל־הָעָם אֲשֶׁר בִּירוּשָׁלַםִ ואל־צפניה בן־מעשיה הכהן וְאֶל־כָּל־הַכֹּהֲנִים לֵאמֹר׃	לֹא שְׁלַחְתִּיךָ בִּשְׁמִי ואל־צפניה בן־מעשיה הכהן אֱמֹר
26	להיות פְּקִדִים בית יהוה לכל־איש משגע וּמתנבא	להיות פָקִיד[c] בְּבית יהוה לכל־איש מתנבא וּלְכָל־אִישׁ משגע
	ואל־הצינֹק	ואל־הצִּנּוֹר[d]
27	למה לֹא גָעַרְתָּ	למה גְעַרְתֶּם
28	כִּי על־כן שלח אֵלֵינוּ בבל לאמר	הֲלֹא על־כן שלח כִּי בַחֹדֶשׁ הַזֶּה שָׁלַח אֲלֵיכֶם בבלה[e] לאמר
29	צפניה הַכֹּהֵן	צפניה
	את־הספר הַזֶּה	את־הספר
	ירמיהו הַנָּבִיא	ירמיהו
31	שלח עַל־כָּל־הגולה	שלח אֶל[f]־הגולה

[a] Targ. עַל. [b] Targ. וְעַל. [c] Targ. מְמַנָּא סְגַן כָּהֲנַיָּא. [d] *καταράκτην*.
[e] Targ. לְבָבֶל. [f] Targ. לְוָת.

אֶל־שמעיה	עַל[a]־שמעיה
32 על־שמעיה הַנֶּחֱלָמִי	על־שמעיה
לא־יהיה לו איש ישב בתוך־	ולא־יהיה לָהֶם (מֵהֶם) איש
הָעָם הַזֶּה ולא־יִרְאֶה בַּטּוב	בתוֹכְכֶם לראות הַטוב אשר־
אשר־אני עשה־לְעַמִּי נְאֻם־	אני עשה לָכֶם לא
יְהוָה כִּי־סָרָה דִבֶּר עַל־יְהוָה	יִרְאוּ

CAPUT XXX.

2 כְּתָב־לְךָ	כתֹב
אֶל־ספר	עַל[b]־ספר
4 אֶל־ישראל וְאֶל־יְהודה	עַל־ישראל וִיהודה[c]
5 כִּי־כה אמר יהוה קול חֲרָדָה	כה אמר יהוה קול אֵימָה
שָׁמָעְנוּ	תִּשְׁמְעוּ
6 שאלו־נָא וראו אם־יֹלֵד	שאלו וראו אם־יָלַד זכר וְעַל־הַחֲרָדָה
זכר	אֲשֶׁר בָּהּ יֹאחֲזוּ מָתְנַיִם וְיֶשַׁע
ידיו על־חלציו כַּיּוֹלֵדָה וְנהפכו	וְידיו על־חלציו נהפכו פנים
כָל־פנים לירקון	לירקון
7 הוֹי כי גדול	כי הָיָה גדול
מֵאַיִן כמהו	וְאֵין[d] כמהו
8 וְהָיָה ביום ההוא נאם יהוה	ביום ההוא נאם יהוה אשבר
צְבָאוֹת אשבר עֻלּוֹ מעל	הָעֹל מעל צוארָם ומוסרותֵיהֶם
צוארֶךָ ומוסרותֶיךָ אנתק	אנתק ולא־יעבדו עוד
ולא־יעבדו־בוֹ עוד זרים:	לְזרים
9 אֲשֶׁר אקים להם	אקים להם
10 וְאַתָּה אַל־תִּירָא עַבְדִּי יַעֲקֹב	Desunt
נְאֻם־יְהוָה וְאַל־תֵּחַת יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי	
הִנְנִי מוֹשִׁיעֲךָ מֵרָחוֹק וְאֶת־זַרְעֲךָ	
מֵאֶרֶץ שִׁבְיָם וְשָׁב יַעֲקֹב וְשָׁקַט	
11 וְשַׁאֲנַן וְאֵין מַחֲרִיד׃ כִּי־אִתְּךָ	
אֲנִי נְאֻם־יְהוָה לְהוֹשִׁיעֶךָ כִּי	

[a] Targ. עַל. [b] Targ. עַל. [c] Targ. עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל וִיהוּדָה. [d] Targ. לֵית.

	אֶעֱשֶׂה כָלָה בְּכָל־הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר הֲפִיצוֹתִיךָ שָּׁם אַךְ אֹתְךָ לֹא־ אֶעֱשֶׂה כָלָה וְיִסַּרְתִּיךָ לַמִּשְׁפָּט וְנַקֵּה לֹא אֲנַקֶּךָּ׃	Desunt
12	כִּי כֹה אמר יהוה אָנוּשׁ לְשִׁבְרֵךְ	כה אמר יהוה הֲשָׁאתִי שֶׁבֶר
13	אין־דן דינך לְמָזוֹר רְפֻאוֹת תְּעָלָה אין לך	אין־דן דינך למזור[a] רְפֻאַת (כְּרְפֻאַת) תּוֹעֶלֶת אין לך
14	אוֹתָךְ לא ידרשו על רֹב עונך	לא ידרשו על כֹּל עונך
15	מַה־תִּזְעַק עַל־שִׁבְרֵךְ אָנוּשׁ מַכְאֹבֵךְ עַל רֹב עֲוֹנֵךְ עָצְמוּ חַטֹּאתַיִךְ עָשִׂיתִי אֵלֶּה לָךְ	Desunt
16	כֻּלָּם בַּשְּׁבִי יֵלֵכוּ	כָּל־בְּשָׂרָם יְלַחֵכוּ (יֹאכֵלוּ) עַל רֹב עֲוֹנֵךְ עָצְמוּ חַטֹּאתַיִךְ עָשׂוּ אֵלֶּה לָךְ
17	כי אעלה ארכה לָךְ וממכּוֹתַיִךְ ארפאך	כי אעלה ארכתך וממכה נַחְלָה ארפאך[b]
	כי נדחה קָרְאוּ לָךְ צִיּוֹן היא דרש אין לה	כי נדחה נִקְרֵאת צֵידְכֶם היא כִּי דרש אין לה
	הנני־שב שבות אָהֳלֵי יעקוב וּמִשְׁכְּנוֹתָיו ארחם וְאַרְמוֹן	הנני־שב שבות יעקוב וְשִׁבְיוֹ (וּשְׁבוּתוֹ) ארחם וְהֶהָמוֹן (וְהָעָם)
19	ויצא מהם תּוֹדָה וְקוֹל משחקים וְהִכְבַּדְתִּים וְלֹא יִצְעָרוּ	ויצאו מהם מְשׁוֹרְרִים[c] (תודות) קול משחקים Deest
20	וְהָיוּ בָנָיו וַעֲדָתוֹ על כָּל־לֹחֲצָיו	וּבָאוּ (וְהָלְכוּ) בְּנֵיהֶם וַעֲדָתָם עַל־לֹחֲצֵיהֶם[d]
21	והיה אדירו ממנו ומשלו מִקִּרְבּוֹ יצא וְהִקְרַבְתִּיו וְנִגַּשׁ אלי עָרַב את־לבו לָגֶשֶׁת אלי	והיו אדירו (אֲבִירָו) עֲלֵיהֶם ומשלו מִמֶּנּוּ יצא וְקִבַּצְתִּים וְיָשׁוּבוּ[e] אלי נָתַן את־לבו לשוב אלי
22	וִהְיִיתֶם לִי לְעָם וְאָנֹכִי אֶהְיֶה לָכֶם לֵאלֹהִים׃	Desunt

[a] *εἰς ἀλγηρόν.* [b] Cf. vs. 12. [c] Targ. מַעֲלֵי תוֹדְתָא. [d] Targ. דְּהַקֵּיחוֹן.
[e] Targ. וְאֶקָרְבִנּוּן וְיִתְנְחוֹן.

23	הִנֵּה סערת יהוה חמה יצאה	כִּי סערת יהוה יצאה בְחמה[a]
	סער מתגורר על־רֹאשׁ רשעים	יָצָא סער מתגורר על־רשעים
	יחוּל	יבוֹא

CAPUT XXXI.

1	לכל משפחות ישראל	למשפַחת ישראל
2	מצא חֵן במדבר עַם שְׂרִידֵי חרב	מצא חֹם במדבר עִם־שְׂדוּדֵי
	הלוֹךְ לְהַרְגִּיעוֹ ישראל	חרב הָלְכוּ וְלֹא הָרְגוּ ישראל
3	מרחוק יהוה נראה לִי וְאהבת	יהוה מרחוק נראה לוֹ אהבת
	עולם אהבתיך על־כן משכתיך	עולם אהבתיך על־כן משכתיך
	חסד	לְחסד
	עוֹד אבנך	כִּי אבנך
	תַּעְדִּי תֻפַּיִךְ	תִּקְחִי תֹּף[b]
	בִּמְחוֹל משחקים	בִקְהַל[c] משחקים
5	עוֹד תִּטְּעִי כרמים	כִּי תִטְעוּ כרמים
	נָטְעוּ נֹטְעִים וְחִלֵּלוּ	נִטְעוּ וְהַלְלוּ
6	קָרְאוּ נצרים בְּהַר אפרים קומו	קְרִיאַת נצרים בְּהָרֵי אפרים קומו
	וְנַעֲלֶה ציון אל־יהוה אלהינו	וַעֲלוּ ציון אל־יהוה אלהיכֶם
7	כי־כה אמר יהוה רָנּוּ ליעקב	כי־כה אמר יהוה ליעקב שמחוּ
	שִׂמְחָה וצהלו	וצהלו (וְדַבְּרוּ)
	הללו וְאמרו הוֹשַׁע יהוה את־	וְהללו אמרו הוֹשִׁיעַ יהוה את־
	עַמְּךָ	עַמּוֹ[d]
8	מֵאֶרֶץ צפון	מִצפון
	בָּם עִוֵּר וּפִסֵּחַ הָרָה וְיֹלֶדֶת יַחְדָּו	בְּמוֹעֵד (הַ)פֶּסַח וְיָלְדָה
	ישובו הנה	וְישובו הנה
9	בבכי יבֹאו	בבכי יֵצְאוּ[e]
	אוֹלִיכֵם אֶל־נחלי מים	מִתְלוֹנֵן (אולִינֵם) עַל[f]־נחלי מים
	לא יִכָּשְׁלוּ בה	וְלֹא יִתְעוּ בה
10	דִּבְרֵי־יהוה	דִּבְרֵי־יהוה
	וְאמרו	אמרו

---

[a] Targ. בִּרְגַז נְפָקָא. [b] Cf. Exod. 15:20. [c] Targ. בְּסִיעַת. [d] Targ. יַת עַמֵּיהּ. [e] Targ. בְּמִגְלֵיהוֹן כַּד הָווֹ בָּכָן. [f] Targ. עַל.

	יקבצנו	וִיקבצנו
11	וּגאלו מיד חָזק ממנו	גאלו מיד חֲזקִים[a] ממנו
12	ובאו ורננו בִמְרוֹם־ציון וְנָהרו	ובאו ורננו בְּהַר[b]־ציון וּבָאו
	אל־טוב יהוה על־דגן וְעַל־	(וּמְהָרו) אל־טוב יהוה על־
	תירש וְעַל־יִצְהָר וְעַל־בְּנֵי־צאן	אֶרֶץ דגן וְתירש[c] וּפְרִי ובקר וָצאן
	ובקר והיתה נפשם כְּגַן רָוֶה	והיתה נפשם כְּעֵץ פְּרִי ולא־
	ולא־יוֹסִיפוּ לְדַאֲבָה עוד	יִרְעָבוּ (לְרַעֲבָה?) עוד[d]
13	אז תשמח בתולה בְּמָחוֹל וּבחרים	אז תשמחנָה בתולות בִּקְהַל בחרים
	וזקנים יַחְדָּו	וזקנים יֶחֱדוּ
	וְנִחַמְתִּים ושמחתים מִיגוֹנָם	ושמחתים
14	ורויתי נפש הכהנים דָּשֶׁן	רִבֵּיתִי (הִגְדַּלְתִּי) ורויתי נפש הכהנים
		בְּנֵי לֵוִי[e]
	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	Deest
15	בכי תמרורים רחל מבכה עַל־	וּבכי וְתמרורים רחל מבכה
	בָּנֶיהָ מאנה לְהִנָּחֵם על־בניה	מאנה לָנוּחַ על־בניה כי
	כי אֵינֶנּוּ	אֵינָם[f]
16	מִנְעִי קולך מבכי ועיניך מדמעָה	יִמָּנַע קולך מבכי ועיניך מדמעוֹתָיִךְ
	כי יש שכר לפעלָתֵךְ נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	כי יש שכר לפעלֹתָיִךְ[g]
	מארץ אוֹיֵב	מארץ אוֹיְבִים[h]
17	וְיֵשׁ־תקוה לאחריתך נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	תקוה לאחריתך (זִכָּרוֹן לְבָנָיִךְ)
	וְשָׁבוּ בָנִים לִגְבוּלָם	
18	שָׁמוֹעַ שמעתי	שְׁמוּעָה שמעתי
	כעגל לא לֻמָּד	אָנֹכִי (אֲנִי) כעגל לא לֻמַּדְתִּי[i]
19	כי־אחרי שׁוּבִי	כי־אחרי שִׁבְיִי
	סָפַקְתִּי עַל־יָרֵךְ בֹּשְׁתִּי וְגַם־	נֶאֱנַחְתִּי (ספדתי) על־יוֹם בֹּשֶׁת
	נִכְלַמְתִּי כי נשאתי חרפַּת	וְהֶרְאֵיתִיךָ כי נשאתי חרפָּה
	נעורי	מִנְּעוּרַי[k]
20	הֲבֵן יקיר לי אפרים אִם ילד	בן יקיר אפרים לי ילד שעשועים
	שעשועים כי־מדי דַבְּרִי בו	כי־מדי דְּבָרַי[l] בו זכר
	זכר אזכרנו עוֹד	אזכרנו
	הָמוּ מֵעַי לוֹ	מִהַרְתִּי אֵלָיו (לו)

[a] Targ. מִיַּד דְּהַתְקִיפִין. [b] Targ. בְּטוּר. [c] Cf. Deut. 33:28. [d] Vid. vs. 25.
[e] Cf. 33:18. [f] Targ. אֲרֵי גְלוֹ. [g] Targ. לְעוֹבָדַיִךְ. [h] Targ. מֵאֲרַע בַּעֲלֵי דְבָבֵיהוֹן.
[i] Targ. וְלָא אַלֵּפְנָא. [k] Cf. Ps. 129:1. [l] Targ. פִּתְגָּמֵי אוֹרָיְתִי.

21	הציבי לך צינים שמי לך	התיצבי ציון שמי תמרוריב(?)[a]
	תמרורים שתי לבך למסלה	שתי לבך לכתפת(?)
	שבי אל־עריך אלה	שבי אל־עריך אבלה[b]
22	כי־ברא יהוה חדשה בארץ	כי־ברא יהוה תשועה (ישע) למטע
	נקבה תסובב גבר	חדש בתשועה יסובב גברים
23	כה־אמר יהוה צבאות אלהי	כי כה־אמר יהוה
	ישראל	
	בשובי את־שבותם יברכך יהוה	בשובי את־שבותו יברך (ברוך) יהוה
	נוה־צדק הר הקדש	על־צדק הר קדשו
24	וישבו בה יהודה וכל־עריו	וישבים בערי יהודה ובכל־ארצו
	יחדו אכרים ונסעו בעדר	יחדו עם־אכר ונשאו בעדר
25	כי הרויתי נפש עיפה וכל־נפש	כי הרויתי כל־נפש צמאה וכל־נפש
	דאבה מלאתי	רעבה מלאתי
26	ושנתי ערבה לי	ושנתי ערבה לי היתה
27	הנה ימים באים	לכן הנה ימים באים
	את־בית ישראל ואת־בית יהודה	את־ישראל ואת־יהודה
28	ולנתוש ולהרס ולהאביד	Deest
	לא־יאמרו עוד אבות אכלו בסר	לא־יאמרו האבות אכלו בסר ושני
	ושני בנים תקהינה	הבנים תקהינה
30	כל־האדם האכל	והאכל
32	אשר־המה הפרו את־בריתי	כי המה לא עמדו (הקימו את־)
	ואנכי בעלתי בם	(בּ)בריתי ואנכי בחלתי בם[c]
33	כי זאת הברית	כי זאת בריתי
	נתתי את־תורתי	נתון אתן את־תורתי
	ועל־לבם אכתבנה	ועל־לבותיהם אכתבן
34	ולא ילמדו עוד	ולא ילמדו
	דעו את־יהוה	דע את־יהוה
	נאם־יהוה	Deest
	לעונם ולחטאתם	לעונותיהם ולחטאותיהם[d]
35	נתן שמש לאור יומם	נתן השמש לאור היום
	חקת	Deest
	לאור לילה	לאור הלילה

[a] *ποίησον τιμωρίαν*. [b] Aram. אליה(?). [c] Cf. 14:19. [d] Vid. 16:18; 18:23; 36:3.—Targ. לחוביהון וחטאיהון.

	רֹגַע הַיָּם	וְרָגַשׁ (וְרָגֵז) בַּיָּם
37	כֹּה אמר יהוה אם־יִמַּדּוּ שמים	אם־יֵרֹמּוּ (יָרֻמּוּ) שמים למעלה
	מִלְמעלה ויֵחָקְרוּ מוֹסְדֵי־ארץ	אמר יהוה ואם יֵרָחֵק (וְיִשָּׁפֵל)
	למטה גם־אני אמאס בְּכָל־	יְסוֹד־ארץ למטה גם־אני לא
	זרע ישראל על־כל־אשר	אמאס בזרע ישראל נאם־יהוה
	עשו נאם־יהוה	על־כל־אשר עשו
38	ּ̣̊ באים	יָמִים באים
	ונבנתה הָעיר	ונבנתה עיר
	ממגדל חֲנַנְאֵל	ממגדל חנמאל[a]
39	ויצא עוֹד קָוֵהּ הַמִּדָּה נגדּוֹ	ויצא קַו מדתה נגדם עד גבעוֹת גרב
	על גִּבְעַת גרב ונסב	ונסב סָבִיב בַּאֲבָנִים יְקָרוֹת
	גֹּעָתָה	(בְּאַבְנֵי־חֵפֶץ)
40	וְכָל־הָעֵמֶק הַפְּגָרִים וְהַדֶּשֶׁן	Deest
	וכל־השרמות	וכל־השרמות[b]
	לא־ינתש ולא־יהרס עוֹד לעולם	וְלֹא עוֹד ינתש ולא־יהרס עַד־עולם

CAPUT XXXII.

1	אל־ירמיהו מאת יהוה	מאת יהוה אל־ירמיהו
	לצדקיהו מלך יְהוּדָה היא	לַמֶּלֶךְ צדקיהו[c] היא השנה שמנה־
	השנה שמנה־עשרה שָׁנָה	עשרה לְמֶלֶךְ נבוכדראצר מֶלֶךְ
	לִנבוכדראצר	בָּבֶל
2	וְאָז חיל מלך בבל	וחיל מלך בבל
	וירמיהו הַנָּבִיא הָיָה כלוא	וירמיהו כלוא (שָׁמוּר)
	אשר בֵּית־מלך יְהוּדָה	אשר בְּבֵית[d]־מלך
3	אשר כלאו צדקיהו מלך־יְהוּדָה	בַּאשר כלאו הַמֶּלֶךְ צדקיהו
	בְּיַד מלך־בבל	בִּידֵי מלך־בבל
4	וצדקיהו מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה	וצדקיהו
	בְּיַד מלך־בבל	בִּידֵי מלך־בבל
	ודבר פיו עִם־פיו	ודבר פיו אֶל־פיו[e]
5	הָבבל יוֹלִיךְ אֶת־צדקיהו ושם יִהְיֶה	וְיֵלֵךְ צדקיהו בבל (בבלָה) ושם יֵשֵׁב

[a] ut 32:9. [b] *καὶ πάντες* Ἀσαρημώθ [c] Vid. vs. 8; 34:6. [d] Targ. דִּי בְבֵית. [e] Cf. Num. 12:8.

	עַד־פָּקְדִי אֹתוֹ נְאֻם־יְהוָה כִּי תִלָּחֲמוּ אֶת־הַכַּשְׂדִּים לֹא תַצְלִיחוּ	Desunt
6	וַיֹּאמֶר ירמיהו היה דבר־יהוה אֵלַי לאמר	וּדבר־יהוה היה אֶל־ירמיהו לאמר
7	משפַּט הַגְּאֻלָּה לִקְנוֹת	משפָּט לָקַחַת לְמִקְנָה
8	בן־דדי כִּדְבַר יְהוָה	בן־שַׁלֻּם דדי.
	ויאמר אֵלַי קנה נָא	ויאמר קנה לְךָ[a]
	אשר־בענתות אשר בארץ בנימין	אשר בארץ בנימין אשר־בענתות
	כי לך משפַּט הַיְרֻשָּׁה וּלְךָ הַגְּאֻלָּה קְנֵה־לָךְ	כי לך משפָּט לִקְנוֹתוֹ וְאַתָּה הַגָּדוֹל (ולך הַגְּדֻלָּה)
9	ואקנה את־הַשָּׂדֶה מֵאֵת חנמאל אֲשֶׁר בַּעֲנָתֹת	ואקנה את־שְׂדֵה חנמאל Deest
	ואשקלה־לו אֶת־הַכֶּסֶף שִׁבְעָה שקלים ועשרה הַכסף	ואשקלה־לו שבעה שקלים ועשרה כסף
10	ואכתב בַּספר	ואכתב אֶל־ספר
11	הַמִּצְוָה וְהַחֻקִּים וְאֶת־הַגָּלוּי	Deest
12	ואתן אֶת־הַסֵּפֶר הַמִּקְנָה	ואתן אֹתוֹ (וָאֶתְּנֵהוּ)
	לעיני חנמאל דדי ולעיני הָעֵדִים הכתבים	לעיני חנמאל בֶּן־דדי ולעיני הָאֲנָשִׁים הָעֹמְדִים וְהכתבים
	לעיני כָּל־היהודים הַיֹּשְׁבִים בחצר המטרה	וּלעיני היהודים אֲשֶׁר בחצר המטרה
14	יהוה צבאות אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה צבאות
	אֶת־הַסְּפָרִים הָאֵלֶּה	Deest
	וְאֵת הֶחָתוּם ואת ספר הַגָּלוּי הַזֶּה ונתתם בכלי־חרש למען יַעַמְדוּ	ואת ספר הַקָּרוּא ונתתו בכלי־חרש למען יעמד
		—
15	יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה
	בתים וְשדות	שדות וּבתים
17	אֲהָהּ אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִה הִנֵּה	אַתָּה יְהוָה[b]
	ובזרעך הנטויה לֹא־יִפָּלֵא ממך כל־דבר	ובזרעך הנטויה וְהָרָמָה[c] לֹא־יִכָּלֵא[d] (יִסָּתֵר[e]) ממך כל־דבר

[a] ut vs. 7. [b] Cf. 1:6; 4:10; 14:18. [c] Targ. מְרַמְּמָא. [d] Vid. vs. 27. [e] Targ. לָא יִתְכַּסֵּי.

18	עון אבות	עוֹנוֹת[a] אבות
	יְהוָֹה צְבָאוֹת שְׁמוֹ	Deest
19	גדל העצה ורב העליליה אֲשֶׁר־	יְהוָֹה גדל העצה ורב העליליה הָאֵל
	עיניך פְקֻחוֹת עַל־כָּל־דרכי בני	הַגָּדוֹל צְבָאוֹת וּגְדֹל שֵׁם יְהוָֹה
	אדם לתת לאיש כִּדְרָכָיו	עיניך אֶל־דרכי בני הָאדם לתת
	וְכִפְרִי מַעֲלָלָיו	לאיש כְּדַרְכּוֹ
20	וּבָאדם	וּבִבְנֵי אדם (וּבִילִידֵי הָאֲדָמָה)
21	וּביד חזקה	ביד חזקה
	ובמוֹרָא גָּדוֹל	ובמַרְאִים[b] גְּדוֹלִים[c]
22	לָתֵת לָהֶם	Deest
23	ויִרְשׁוּ אתה	ויִקְחוּ אתה
	ובתרָוֹתְךָ	ובתרוֹתֶיךָ
	את כל־אשר צִוִּיתָה להם לַעֲשׂוֹת	את כל־אשר צִוִּיתִי להם
	וַתַּקְרֵא אֹתָם את כל־הרָעָה הַזֹּאת	וַיִּקְרִיאוּ לָהֶם את כל־הרעוֹת הָאֵלֶּה
24	הנה הַסֹּלְלוֹת בָּאוּ	הנה הֶהָמוֹן (הַחַיִל) בא
	בְּיַד הכשדים	בִּידֵי הכשדים
	וְהַדֶּבֶר	Deest
	וַאשר דברת היה וְהִנְּךָ רֹאֶה	כַּאשר דברת כֵּן היה
25	ואתה אמרת אלי אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה	ואתה אמרת אלי
	וְהָעֵד עדים	וָאֶכְתֹּב סֵפֶר וָאֶחְתֹּם וָאָעִיד עדים
	בְּיַד הכשדים	בִּידֵי הכשדים
	אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ לאמר	אֵלַי לאמר
27	הִנֵּה אני יהוה	אני יהוה
	הממני יִפָּלֵא כל־דבר	הממני יִכָּלֵא[d] (יִסָּתֵר) כל־דבר
28	לכן כה אמר יהוה הִנְנִי נֹתֵן	לכן כה אמר יהוה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
	אֶת־העיר הזֹּאת בְּיַד הַכַּשְׂדִּים	הִנָּתֹן תִּנָּתֵן[e] העיר הַהִיא בִּידֵי
	וּבְיַד נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מלך־בבל	מלך־בבל
29	וּשְׂרָפוּהָ וְאֵת הבתים	וְשָׂרְפוּ אֶת־הבתים
30	כִּי בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אַךְ מַכְעִסִים אֹתִי	Desunt
	בְּמַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵיהֶם נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	
31	היתה לִי העיר הזאת	היתה העיר הזאת
32	על כל־רָעַת בני־ישראל וּבְנֵי יְהודה על כל־רעת בני־ישראל וִיהודה	

[a] Targ. חוֹבֵי. [b] Targ. וּבְחֶזְוָנָא. [c] Cf. Exod. 3:8. [d] Vid. vs. 17.
[e] Vid. 34:2.

	מלכיהם שריהם כהניהם ונביאיהם וְאִישׁ יהודה וישבֵי יְרושלם	ומלכיהם וְשריהם וְכהניהם ונביאיהם אַנְשֵׁי יהודה וְהַיֹּשְׁבִים בִּירושלם
33	וְלַמֵּד אתם השכם וְלַמֵּד וְאֵינָם שֹׁמְעִים לקחת מוסר	וְלִמַּדְתִּי אתם השכם ולֹא שָׁמְעוּ עוֹד לקחת מוסר
34	לְטַמְּאוֹ	בְּטֻמְאוֹתָם[a]
35	לְהַעֲבִיר את־בניהם ואת־בנותיהם למלך	לְהַקְרִיב את־בניהם ואת־בנותיהם למלך הַמֶּלֶךְ
36	ועתה לָכֵן כה־אמר יהוה אלהי ישראל אֶל־העיר הזאת אשר אַתֶּם אֹמְרִים נִתְּנָה בְּיַד מלך־בבל ובדֶּבֶר	ועתה כה־אמר יהוה אלהי ישראל עַל[b]־העיר הזאת אשר אַתָּה אֹמֵר[c] תִּנָּתֵן בִּידֵי מלך־בבל ובשֶּׁבִי[d] (ובְמִשְׁלַחַת)
37	מכל־הָאֲרָצוֹת	מכל הָאָרֶץ
	והשבתים לָבֶטַח	והשבתים בְּטֻחִים
39	לב אֶחָד ודרך אֶחָד	דרך אַחֵר ולֵב אַחֵר
	לטוב להם	ולטוב להם
40	לְהֵיטִיבִי אוֹתָם	Deest
	לבלתי סור מעלי	לבלתי סוּרָם מעלי
41	וְשַׂשְׂתִּי עֲלֵיהֶם	וּפָקַדְתִּי
	בכל־לבי ובכל־נַפְשִׁי	ובכל־לבי ובכל־נֶפֶשׁ
42	כאשר הבאתי אֶל־העם הזה את כל־הרָעָה הגדֹלָה הַזֹּאת	כאשר הבאתי עַל[e]־העם הזה את כל־הרעות הגדולות הָאֵלֶּה
	את־כל־הטובָה	את־כל־הטובות
43	ונקנָה הַשָּׂדֶה	ונקנו עוד שׂדוֹת[f]
	אַתֶּם אֹמְרִים	אַתָּה אֹמֵר[g]
	נתנָה בְּיַד הכשדים	וְנתנו בִּידֵי הכשדים
44	שדות בכסף יקנו וכָתוב בספר וְחָתוֹם וְהָעֵד עדים	וְיִקנו שדות בכסף ותִכְתּוב בספר ותַחְתּוֹם וְתָעִיד עדים
	ובִסְבִיבֵי ירושלם	ובְסָבִיב ירושלם
	ובערי השפלה ובערי הנגב	ובערי השפלה ובערי הנגב[h]
	נְאֻם־יְהוָה	Deest

---

[a] Cf. Lev. 16 : 16. [b] Targ. עַל. [c] Vid. vs. 43. [d] *ἐν ἀποστολῇ*. [e] Targ. עַל. [f] Targ. וְיִזְדַּבְּנוּן חַקְלִין. [g] Vid. vs. 36. [h] *ἐν πόλεσι τῆς Σεφηλὰ καὶ ἐν πόλεσι τῆς ναγέβ*.

CAPUT XXXIII.

2	עֹשֵׂהּ יְהוָֹה יוצר אותה	עֹשֵׂה אֶרֶץ וְיוצר אותה[a]
3	ובצרות לא ידעתם	ובצרות אֲשֶׁר לא ידעתם[b] (וּנְצֻרוֹת?[c])
4	יהוה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה
	מַלְכֵי יהודה	מֶלֶךְ יהודה
	אל־הסללות ואֶל־הֶחָרֶב	אֶל־הסללות והַדָּיֵק
5	בָּאִים	Deest
	ולמלאם	ולמלאהּ
	וַאֲשֶׁר הסתרתי פני מֵהָעִיר הַזֹּאת	והסתרתי פני מֵהֶם
6	ורפאתם וגליתי להם עֲתֶרֶת	וגליתי להם ורפאתיהָ וְעָשִׂיתִי גַּם־
	שלום וֶאמת	שלום גַּם־אמת
8	מכל־עוֹנָם	מכל־עוֹנֹתֵיהֶם[d]
	וְסָלַחְתִּי לְכוֹל־עונותיהם	ולֹא־אֶזְכֹּר לַעונותיהם[e]
	וַאֲשֶׁר פשעו בי	וּפשעו בי
9	והיתה לִּי לְשֵׁם ששון	והיתה לְששון
	גוֹיֵי הארץ	גוי הארץ
	את־כל־הטובָה אשר אנכי עשה	את כל־הטובות אשר אנכי
	אוֹתָם	עשה
	אשר אנכי עשה לָהּ	אשר אנכי עשה לָהֶם[f]
10	מאין אדם ומֵאֵין בהמה	מאין אדם ובהמה[g]
	ובְחֻצוֹת ירושלם	וּמִחוּץ ירושלם
	מאין אדם וּמֵאֵין יוֹשֵׁב וּמֵאֵין	מאין אדם ובהמה
	בהמה	
11	מְבִאִים תּוֹדָה בית יהוה	וְיָבִיאוּ מִנְחוֹת (מַתָּנוֹת) לְבֵית[h] יהוה
	את־שבות־הארץ	את־כָּל־שבות־הארץ הַהִיא
	מאין־אדם וְעַד־בהמה ובכל־עריו	מאין אדם ובהמה[i] בכל־עריו
	נְוֵה רעים	נוֹת רעים
13	בערי השפלה ובערי הנגב	ובערי השפלה ובערי הנגב[k]
	על־יְדֵי מונה	על־יַד־מונה

---

[a] Cf. Isa. 45:18. [b] Targ. דְּלָא יְדַעְתּוּנוּן. [c] Targ. וּנְטִירָן=וּנְצֻרוֹת.
[d] Targ. חוֹבֵיהוֹן. [e] Targ. חוֹבֵיהוֹן. [f] Targ. דַּאֲנָא עָבֵיד לְהוֹן. [g] ut 32:43.
[h] Targ. לְבֵית. [i] ut 32:43. [k] Vid. 32:44.

Desunt

14 הִנֵּה יָמִים בָּאִים נְאֻם־יְהוָה
וַהֲקִמֹתִי אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַטּוֹב אֲשֶׁר
דִּבַּרְתִּי אֶל־בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וְעַל־בֵּית
15 יְהוּדָה׃ בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם וּבָעֵת הַהִיא
אַצְמִיחַ לְדָוִד צֶמַח צְדָקָה וְעָשָׂה
16 מִשְׁפָּט וּצְדָקָה בָּאָרֶץ׃ בַּיָּמִים
הָהֵם תִּוָּשַׁע יְהוּדָה וִירוּשָׁלַםִ
תִּשְׁכּוֹן לָבֶטַח וְזֶה אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרָא־לָהּ
17 יְהוָה ׀ צִדְקֵנוּ׃ כִּי־כֹה אָמַר יְהוָה
לֹא־יִכָּרֵת לְדָוִד אִישׁ יֹשֵׁב עַל־
18 כִּסֵּא בֵית־יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ וְלַכֹּהֲנִים
הַלְוִיִּם לֹא־יִכָּרֵת אִישׁ מִלְּפָנָי
מַעֲלֶה עוֹלָה וּמַקְטִיר מִנְחָה
19 וְעֹשֶׂה זֶּבַח כָּל־הַיָּמִים׃ וַיְהִי
דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ לֵאמוֹר׃
20 כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה אִם־תָּפֵרוּ אֶת־
בְּרִיתִי הַיּוֹם וְאֶת־בְּרִיתִי הַלָּיְלָה
וּלְבִלְתִּי הֱיוֹת יוֹמָם־וָלַיְלָה בְּעִתָּם׃
21 גַּם־בְּרִיתִי תֻפַר אֶת־דָּוִד עַבְדִּי
מִהְיוֹת־לוֹ בֵן מֹלֵךְ עַל־כִּסְאוֹ וְאֶת־
22 הַלְוִיִּם הַכֹּהֲנִים מְשָׁרְתָי׃ אֲשֶׁר
לֹא־יִסָּפֵר צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלֹא יִמַּד
חוֹל הַיָּם כֵּן אַרְבֶּה אֶת־זֶרַע דָּוִד
עַבְדִּי וְאֶת־הַלְוִיִּם מְשָׁרְתֵי אֹתִי׃
23 וַיְהִי דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ
24 לֵאמֹר׃ הֲלוֹא רָאִיתָ מָה־הָעָם
הַזֶּה דִּבְּרוּ לֵאמֹר שְׁתֵּי הַמִּשְׁפָּחוֹת
אֲשֶׁר בָּחַר יְהוָה בָּהֶם וַיִּמְאָסֵם
וְאֶת־עַמִּי יִנְאָצוּן מִהְיוֹת עוֹד גּוֹי
25 לִפְנֵיהֶם׃ כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה אִם־לֹא
בְרִיתִי יוֹמָם וָלָיְלָה חֻקּוֹת שָׁמַיִם
26 וָאָרֶץ לֹא־שָׂמְתִּי׃ גַּם־זֶרַע יַעֲקוֹב
וְדָוִד עַבְדִּי אֶמְאַס מִקַּחַת
מִזַּרְעוֹ מֹשְׁלִים אֶל־זֶרַע אַבְרָהָם

	יִשְׂחָק וְיַעֲקֹב כִּי־אָשׁוֹב אֶת־ שְׁבוּתָם וְרִחַמְתִּים׃	Desunt

CAPUT XXXIV.

1	וכל־מַמְלְכוֹת ארץ ממשֶׁלֶת יָדוֹ וְכָל־הָעַמִּים נלְחָמִים על־ ירושלם ועל־כל־עָרֶיהָ לאמר	וכל־ארץ ממשַׁלְתּוֹ נלְחֲמוּ על־ ירושלם ועל־כל־עָרֵי יְהוּדָה לאמר
2	כה־אמר יהוה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הלך וְאָמַרְתָּ אל־צדקיהו הִנְנִי נֹתֵן אֶת־העיר הזאת בְּיַד מלך־בבל	כה־אמר יהוה הלך אל־צדקיהו הִנָּתֹן תִּנָּתֵן[a] העיר הזאת בִּידֵי מלך־בבל וּלְכָדָהּ
3	כִּי תפש תתפש ובידו תנתן ועיניך את־עֵינֵי מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל תראינה וּפִיהוּ אֶת־פִּיךָ יְדַבֵּר ובבל תבוא	וְתפש תתפש ובידָיו תנתן ועיניך את־עֵינָיו תראינה ובבל תבוא
4	עָלֶיךָ לֹא־תָמוּת בֶּחָרֶב	Deest
5	וּבְמִשְׂרְפוֹת אבותיך הַמְּלָכִים הָרִאשֹׁנִים אשר־הָיוּ לפניך כן יִשְׂרְפוּ־לך וְהוֹי אדון יספדו־לך	וְכַאֲשֶׁר סָפְדוּ (וּכְמִסְפְּדוֹת) את־ אבותיך אשר־מָלְכוּ לפניך (בָּרִאשֹׁנָה) יִסְפְּדוּ גַּם־לך הוי[b] אדון וְעַד־שְׁאוֹל יספדו־לך
6	וידבר ירמיהו הַנָּבִיא אל־ צדקיהו מלך יְהוּדָה	וידבר ירמיהו אל־הַמֶּלֶךְ צדקיהו[c]
7	נלְחָמִים על־ירושלם ועל כָּל־ ערי יהודה הַנּוֹתָרוֹת אֶל־ לכיש וְאֶל־עזקה	נלְחַם על־ירושלם ועל־ערי יהודה וְעַל[d]־לכיש וְעַל[e]־עזקה
8	את־כָּל־העם אֲשֶׁר בִּירוּשָׁלַםִ לקרא לָהֶם דרור	את־העם לקרא דרור
9	לבלתי עֲבָד־בָּם בִּיהוּדִי אָחִיהוּ איש	לבלתי עבד איש מִיהוּדָה
10	וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ כל־השרים וכל־העם	וַיָּשׁוּבוּ כל־השרים וכל־הַבָּאִים בַּבְּרִית

[a] Vid. 32:28. [b] Targ. וַי. [c] Vid. 32:1, 3. [d] Targ. עַל. [e] Targ. יַתַּל.

	אֲשֶׁר־בָּאוּ בברית לשלח איש	לשלח איש את־עבדו ואיש את־
	את־עבדו ואיש את־שפחתו	שפחתו וישלחו
	חָפְשִׁים לְבִלְתִּי עֲבָד־בָּם עוֹד	
	וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ וישלחו	
11	וַיָּשׁוּבוּ אַחֲרֵי־כֵן וַיָּשִׁבוּ אֶת־	אוֹתָם[a] לעבדים ולשפחות
	הָעֲבָדִים וְאֶת־הַשְּׁפָחוֹת אֲשֶׁר	
	שִׁלְּחוּ חָפְשִׁים וַיִּכְבִּישׁוּם	
	לעבדים ולשפחות	
12	מֵאֵת יְהוָֹה	Deest
13	יהוה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה
14	מִקֵּץ שֶׁבַע שנים תשלְּחוּ אִישׁ	כִּמְלֹאת שֵׁשׁ שנים תשלַּח את־
	את־אחיו	אחיךָ
	ושלחתו חפשי מֵעִמָּךְ ולא־	ושלחתו חפשי ולא־שמעו אלי
	שמעו אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם אלי	
15	וַתָּשֻׁבוּ אַתֶּם היום וַתַּעֲשׂוּ	וַיָּשֻׁבוּ היום לַעֲשׂוֹת
	וַתִּכְרְתוּ ברית	וַיִּכְרְתוּ ברית
16	וַתָּשֻׁבוּ איש את־עבדו	לְהָשֵׁב איש את־עבדו
	וַתְּכַבְּשׁוּ אֹתָם	Deest
17	לקרא דרור אִישׁ לְאָחִיו וְאִישׁ	לקרא דרור איש לרעהו הנני קרא
	לרעהו הנני קרא לכם דרור	דרור לכם
	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	Deest
	אל־הדבר	וְאל־הדבר[b]
	לזְוָעָה לְכֹל ממלכות הארץ	לזְרֹעָה[c] בְּכֹל ממלכות הארץ
18	את־דִּבְרֵי הַבְּרִית	את־בְּרִיתִי
	העגל אשר כָּרְתוּ לִשְׁנַיִם וַיַּעַבְרוּ	העגל אשר עָשׂוֹ לַעֲבֹד־לוֹ
	בֵּין בְּתָרָיו	
19	שרי יהודה וְשָׂרֵי יְרוּשָׁלַםִ	שרי יהודה וְהָאַדִּירִים[d] (וְהסרסים)
	הַסָּרִסִים והכהנים וְכֹל עַם	והכהנים וְהָעָם
	הָאָרֶץ הָעֹבְרִים בֵּין בִּתְרֵי	
	הָעֵגֶל	
20	ונתתי אותם בְּיַד איביהם וּבְיַד	ונתתי אותם לְאיביהם והיתה

[a] Inc. vs. 11. [b] Targ. וּמִן מוֹתָא. [c] *εἰς διασποράν*. Vid. 24:9. [d] Targ. וְרַבְרְבַיָּא.

	מְבַקְשֵׁי נַפְשָׁם והיתה נבלתם לְמאכל	נבלתם מאכל
21	ואת־שָׂרָיו אתן בְּיַד איביהם וּבְיַד מְבַקְשֵׁי נַפְשָׁם וּבְיַד חיל מלך בבל העלים מעליכֶם	ואת־שָׂרֵיהֶם אתן בִּידֵי איביהם וְחיל מלך בבל לְהעלים מעליהֶם
22	והשבתים אל־העִיר הזאת אתן שְׁמָמָה	והשבתים אל־האָרֶץ הזאת ואתן אוֹתָן (וְאֶתְּנֵן) שׁוֹמֵמוֹת

CAPUT XXXV.

1	בימי יהויקים בֶּן־יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ	בימי יהויקים
2	הלוך אל־בית הרכבים וְדִבַּרְתָּ אוֹתָם והבאותם בית יהוה אל־אחת הַלְּשָׁכוֹת	הלוך אל־בית הרכבים[a] והבאותם אֶל־בית יהוה אל־אחת הַחֲצֵרוֹת
3	וָאֶקַּח את־יַאֲזַנְיָה ואת־כָּל־בניו	ואוֹלִיךְ (וָאָבִיא) את יְכָנְיָה ואת־בניו
4	בית יהוה	אֶל־בית[b] יהוה
	בני חנן בן־יגדליהו	בני חנן בֶּן־חֲנַנְיָה בן־יגדליהו
	לִשְׁכַּת השרים	בֵּית השרים
	לְלִשְׁכַּת מעשיהו	לְבֵית מעשיהו
	שמר הַסַּף	שמר הֶחָצֵר
5	לפני בְּנֵי בֵית־הָרֵכָבִים גבִעים מְלֵאִים יין	לפניהֶם גביעַ יין
	ואמר אֲלֵיהֶם	ואמר
7	וּבַיִת לא־תבנו	וּבָתִּים לא־תבנו
	וכרם לא־תִטָּעוּ וְלֹא יהיה לכם	וכרם לא יהיה לכם
	על־פְּנֵי האדמה אשר אתם גרים שָׁם	על־האדמה אשר אתם גרים עָלֶיהָ (בָּהּ)
8	יהונדב בֶּן־רֵכָב	יהונדב
	לְכֹל אֲשֶׁר צִוָּנוּ	Deest
	נשינו בנינו	וְנשינו ובנינו

---

[a] Ἀρχαβείν. Vid. vs. 3. [b] Targ. לְבֵית.

9	לְשִׁבְתֵּנוּ	לָשֶׁבֶת־שָׁם
	לֹא יִהְיֶה־לָּנוּ	לֹא הָיָה לָנוּ
11	בעלות נבוכדראצר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל אֶל־הארץ	בעלות נבוכדראצר עַל־הארץ[a]
	בֹּאוּ וְנבוא ירושלם	לָבֹא וַנָּבוא אֶל־ירושלם[b]
	ומפני חיל אֲרָם ונשב בִּירוּשָׁלָ͏ִם	ומפני חיל אַשּׁוּר (אַשּׁוּרִים) ונשב שָׁם
12	אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ לאמר	אֵלַי לאמר
13	יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה
	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	Deest
14	הוּקַם אֶת־דִּבְרֵי יהונדב	הֵקִימוּ דָּבָר בְּנֵי יהונדב[c]
	עַד־הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה כִּי שָׁמְעוּ אֵת מִצְוַת אֲבִיהֶם	Desunt
	השכם וְדַבֵּר ולא שמעתם אֵלָי	השכם ולא שמעתם
15	את־כָּל־עבדי הנביאים הַשְׁכֵּם וְשָׁלֹחַ לאמר שֻׁבוּ־נָא איש מדרכו הרעה	את־עבדי הנביאים לאמר שבו איש מדרכו הרעה
	וּשׁבו אֶל־האדמה	וְתֵשְׁבוּ עַל־האדמה[d]
	את־אזנכם ולא שמעתם אֵלָי	את־אזניכם ולא שמעתם
16	כִּי הקימו	וְהקימו
	אֲשֶׁר צִוָּם	Deest
	לֹא שָׁמְעוּ אלי	לא שָׁמַע אלי
17	יהוה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה
	אֶל־יהודה ואֶל־כָּל־יושבי ירושלם	עַל[e]־יהודה וְעַל[f]־יושבי ירושלם
	יַעַן דִּבַּרְתִּי אֲלֵיהֶם וְלֹא שָׁמֵעוּ וָאֶקְרָא לָהֶם וְלֹא עָנוּ	Desunt
18	וּלְבֵית הָרֵכָבִים אָמַר יִרְמְיָהוּ כֹּה־אמר יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יען אשר שְׁמַעְתֶּם עַל־מצות יהונדב אביכם וַתִּשְׁמְרוּ אֶת־כָּל־מִצְוֹתָיו וַתַּעֲשׂוּ כְּכֹל אשר־צוה אֶתְכֶם	לָכֵן כה־אמר יהוה יען אשר שָׁמְעוּ בְּנֵי יהונדב בֶּן־רֵכָב (עַל־) מצות אביהֶם לַעֲשׂוֹת כַּאשר צום אֲבִיהֶם

[a] Targ. עַל אַרְעָא. [b] Targ. לִירוּשְׁלֶם. [c] Cf. vs. 16. [d] Vid. 25:5.—Targ. עַל אַרְעָא. [e] Targ. עַל. [f] Targ. וְעַל.

19	לָכֵן כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָֹה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	Desunt
	לְיוֹנדב	מִבְּנֵי יונדב
	כל־הַיָּמִים	כל־יְמֵי הָאָרֶץ

CAPUT XXXVI.

1	וַיְהִי בשנה הרביעת	בשנה הרביעת
	היה הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ מֵאֵת יהוה לאמר	היה דְּבַר יהוה אֵלַי לאמר
2	וכתבת אֵליה	וכתבת עָליה[b]
	על־יִשְׂרָאֵל	על־יְרוּשָׁלַםִ
	מימי יאשיהו	מימי יאשיהו מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה
3	אולי ישמְעוּ בית יהודה	אולי ישמַע בית יהודה
	למען ישובו אִישׁ מדרכּוֹ הרעה וסלחתי לעוֹנָם ולחטָּאתָם	למען ישובו מדרכָּם[c] הרעה וסלחתי לעוֹנֹתֵיהֶם ולחטֹּאתֵיהֶם[d]
4	ויכתב בָּרוּךְ	ויכתב
	עַל־מגלת־ספר	אֶל־מגלת־ספר
5	אני עָצוּר	אני כָּצוּר
	בית יהוה	אֶל־בית[e] יהוה
6	וּבָאתָ אַתָּה וקראת במגלה	וקראת במגלה הַזֹּאת
	אֲשֶׁר־כָּתַבְתָּ מִפִּי אֶת־דִּבְרֵי יְהוָֹה	Deest
	בית יהוה	בְּבית[f] יהוה
	וְגַם באזני כל־יהודה	וּבאזני כל־יהודה
	תקראֵם	תקרא לָהֶם
7	וישובו אִישׁ מדרכּוֹ הרעה כי־גדול האף וְהַחֵמָה אשר־דבר יהוה אֶל־העם הזה	וישובו מדרכָּם[g] הרעה כי־גדול האף וַחֲמַת יהוה אשר־דבר עַל־[h] העם הזה
8	ויעש ברוך בֶּן־נֵרִיָּה	ויעש ברוך
	ירמיהו הַנָּבִיא	ירמיהו

---

[a] ut Gen. 8:22. [b] Targ. עִלָּהּ. [c] Vid. vs. 7. [d] Vid. 16:18; 18:23; 31:34.—Targ. לְחוֹבֵיהוֹן וּלְחַטָּאֵיהוֹן. [e] Targ. לְבֵית. [f] Targ. בְּבֵית. [g] Vid. vs. 8. [h] Targ. עַל.

	בית יהוה	בְּבית יהוה
9	בשנה הַחֲמִשִׁית לִיהויקים בֶּן־ יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ מלך־יְהוּדָה	בשנה הַשְּׁמִינִית לַמלך יהויקים
	וְכָל־הָעָם הַבָּאִים מֵעָרֵי יהודה בִּירוּשָׁלָם	וּבֵית יהודה
10	בית יהוה בְּלִשְׁכַּת גמריהו	בְּבית יהוה בְּבֵית גמריהו
	פֶּתַח שער	בְּפִתְחֵי שער
	בְּאזני כל־העם	וּבאזני כל־העם
12	וירד בית־המלך עַל־לִשְׁכַּת הספר	וירד אֶל־בית[a]־המלך אֶל[b]־בֵּית הספר
	כל־השרים יוֹשְׁבִים	כל־שרים יָשְׁבוּ
	בן־שְׁמַעְיהו וְאֶלנתן	בן־שְׁלֶמְיהו וִיהוֹנתן
13	בַּסֵּפֶר	Deest
14	אל־ברוך	אל־ברוך בֶּן־נֵרִיָּה
	וָלֵךְ	וּבא[c]
	ברוך בֶּן־נֵרִיָּהוּ	ברוך
	בְּיָדוֹ וַיָּבֹא אליהם	וַיֵּרֶד אליהם
15	שֵׁב נָא וּקְרָאֶנָּה	שְׁב (שׁוּב)[d] קרא
	ויקרא ברוך בְּאָזְנֵיהֶם	ויקרא ברוך
16	פָּחֲדוּ	הִתְיָעֲצוּ (נוֹעֲצוּ)
	ויאמרו אֶל־בָּרוּךְ	ויאמרו
17	הַגֶּד־נָא לָנוּ איך כתבת	איך (אָן) כתבת
	מִפִּיו	Deest
18	ויאמר לָהֶם ברוך	ויאמר ברוך
	יִקְרָא אלי	קָרא אלי יִרְמְיָהוּ
	ואני כֹּתֵב עַל־הַספר בַּדְּיוֹ	ואני כָּתַבְתִּי בְּספר
19	ויאמרו הַשָּׂרִים	ויאמרו
	לך הסתר	לך וְהסתר
	וְאיש אל־ידע	איש אל־ידע
20	בְּלִשְׁכַּת אלישמע הַסֹּפֵר	בבֵית אלישמע
	בְּאָזְנֵי הַמלך את כל־הדברים	לַמלך את כל־הדברים הָאֵלֶּה
21	ויקחה מִלִּשְׁכַּת אלישמע הַסֹּפֵר ויקראֶהָ	ויקחה מִבֵּית אלישמע ויקרא

[a] Targ. לְבֵית. [b] Targ. לְלִשְׁכַּת. [c] Targ. וַאֲתָא. [d] ut vs. 28.—Targ. תּוּב.

22	והמלך יוֹשֵׁב בֵּית החרף	והמלך יָשַׁב בְּבֵית החרף
	בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַתְּשִׁיעִי	Deest
	וְאֶת־הָאָח לפניו מְבֹעָרֶת	ואת אֵשׁ (וְאֵשׁ האח) לפניו
23	יקרעֶהָ בתער הספר וְהַשְׁלֵךְ אֶל־הָאֵשׁ אשר אֶל־האח	יקרעֵן בתער הספר וַיַּשְׁלֵךְ בָּאֵשׁ אשר עַל־האח
	עַל־הָאֵשׁ אשר על־האח	בָּאֵשׁ אשר על־האח
24	ולא־פָחֲדוּ	ולא־פָקְדוּ (דָּרְשׁוּ)
	וְכָל־עבדיו	וַעבדיו
25	וְגַם אלנתן וּדְלָיָהוּ וּגְמַרְיָהוּ הִפְגִּעוּ בַמלך לְבִלְתִּי שְׂרֹף	וְאלנתן וּגְדַלְיָהוּ יָעֲצוּ לַמלך לִשְׂרֹף
	וְלֹא שָׁמַע אֲלֵיהֶם	Desunt
26	וְאֶת־שֶׁלֶמְיָהוּ בֶּן־עַבְדְּאֵל	
	את־ברוך הַסֹּפֵר ואת ירמיהו הַנָּבִיא וַיַּסְתִּרֵם יְהוָה	את־ברוך ואת ירמיהו וַיִּסָּתֵרוּ
27	וְאֶת־הדברים	כָּל־הדברים
28	וכתב עָלֶיהָ	וכתב
	כל־הדברים הָרִאשֹׁנִים	כל־הדברים
	על־המגלה הָרִאשֹׁנָה	על־המגלה
	יהויקים מלך־יְהוּדָה	הַמלך יהויקים
29	וְעַל־יְהוֹיָקִים מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה תֹּאמַר	וְאָמַרְתָּ
	וְהִשְׁבִּית	וְשָׁבַת (וְנִשְׁבַּת)
30	לחרב בַּיּוֹם ולקרח בַּלַּילָה	לחרב הַיּוֹם ולקרח הַלַּילָה
31	אֶת־עֲוֺנָם	Deest
	והבאתי עֲלֵיהֶם	והבאתי עָלָיו
	ואל־אִישׁ יהודה	ואל־אֶרֶץ יהודה
32	וְיִרְמְיָהוּ לָקַח מגלה אחרת וַיִּתְּנָהּ אֶל־בָּרוּךְ בֶּן־נֵרִיָּה הַסֹּפֵר	וַיִּקַּח בָּרוּךְ מגלה אחרת
	מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה בָּאֵשׁ	Deest
	ועוד נוֹסַף עֲלֵיהֶם דברים רבים כָּהֵמָּה	ועוד נוֹסְפוּ[a] עָלֶיהָ דברים רבים מֵהֵמָּה

[a] Targ. אִתּוֹסַפוּ.

CAPUT XXXVII.

1	וימלך־מֶלֶךְ צדקיהו	וימלך צדקיהו
	כָּנְיָהוּ בֶּן־יהויקים	יהויקים
	מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל בְּאֶרֶץ יְהודה	לִמְלֹךְ בִּיהודה
2	ולא שָׁמַע	ולא שָׁמְעוּ
	ביד ירמיהו הַנָּבִיא	ביד ירמיהו
	אל־ירמיהו הַנָּבִיא	אל־ירמיהו
	אל־יהוה אֱלֹהֵינוּ	אל־יהוה
4	בא וְיֹצֵא בתוך הָעָם	בא וְיָצָא בתוך הָעִיר
	בית הכליא	אֶל־בֵּית[a] הכלוא
5	הַצָּרִים עַל־יְרוּשָׁלִַם	Deest
	וַיֵּעָלוּ מֵעַל ירושלם	וַיַּעֲלוּ על־ירושלם
6	אל־ירמיהו הַנָּבִיא לאמר	אל־ירמיהו[b] לאמר
7	יהוה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה
	כה תאמְרוּ	כה תאמַר
	השלח אֶתְכֶם אֵלַי	השלח אֵלֶיךָ
	שָׁב לְאַרְצוֹ מצרים	יָשֻׁבוּ לְאֶרֶץ מצרים
8	ושבו הכשדים	ושבו הֵמָּה הכשדים
9	כה אמר יהוה אל־תַּשִּׁאוּ נפשתיכם	כִּי כה אמר יהוה אל־תִּשְׂאוּ (תִּנַּשְׂאוּ) בְנפשתיכם[c]
10	כִּי אם־הכיתם	וְאם־הכיתם
	ונשארו־בָם	ונשארו
	איש בְּאָהֳלוֹ יקומו	איש בִּמְקוֹמוֹ הֵמָּה יקומו
11	בְּהֵעָלוֹת חיל הכשדים	בַּעֲלוֹת חיל הכשדים
12	וַיֵּצֵא ירמיהו	יָצָא ירמיהו
	לַחֲלִק	לָקַחַת (לִלְקֹחַ?)
13	ושם בַּעַל פְּקִדֻת וּשְׁמוֹ יִרְאִיָּיה	ושם אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר שָׁכַן אֶצְלוֹ (עִמּוֹ) שְׂרָיָה (צְרוּיָה)
	את־ירמיהו הַנָּבִיא	את־ירמיהו
14	ויאמר יִרְמְיָהוּ שקר אֵינֶנִּי נפל עַל־הכשדים	ויאמר שקר לֹא אֶל־הכשדים[d] אֲנִי נפל

[a] ut vs. 18.—Targ. בְּבֵית. [b] Targ. עִם יִרְמְיָה לְמֵימָר. [c] Vid. 44:7.
[d] ut vs. 13.—Targ. לְכַסְדָּאֵי.

Verse	MT	LXX
	יִרְאִיָּיה	שְׂרָיָה (צְרוּיָה)
15	וְנָתְנוּ אותו בֵּית הָאֵסוּר בית יהונתן	וְשָׁלְחוּ אותו אֶל־בית יהונתן
	עשו לבית הַכלא	עשו לבית כלא[a]
16	כִּי בָא ירמיהו	וַיָּבֹא ירמיהו
	ואל־הַחֲנֻיּוֹת וישב־שם יִרְמְיָהוּ	ואל־הַחֶרֶת[b] וישב־שם
17	וישלח הַמֶּלֶךְ צדקיהו וַיִּקָּחֵהוּ וישאלהו המלך בְּבֵיתוֹ בסתר וַיֹּאמֶר היש דבר מאת יהוה ויאמר יִרְמְיָהוּ יש וַיֹּאמֶר בְּיַד־מלך בבל תנתן	וישלח צדקיהו וַיִּקְרָאֵהוּ וישאלהו המלך בסתר לֵאמֹר היש הַדבר מאת יהוה ויאמר יש בְּיַדִי מלך בבל תנתי
18	אל־המלך צִדְקִיָּהוּ	אל־המלך
	כי־נְתַתֶּם אותי אל־בית הַכלא	כי־נָתַתָּ אותי אל־בית כלא[c]
19	ואיו	ואיה
	לא־יבוא מלך־בבל עֲלֵיכֶם וְעַל־הארץ הזאת	כִּי לא־יבוא מלך בבל על־הארץ הזאת
20	שְׁמַע־נָא	Deest
	תִּפָּל־נָא תחנתי	תִּפֹּל תחנתי
	וְאַל־תשבני בית יהונתן הספר וְלֹא אָמוּת שם	וְלָמָּה תשבני אֶל־בית[d] יהונתן הספר וּמַתִּי שם
21	המלך צִדְקִיָּהוּ	המלך
	ויפקדו אֶת־יִרְמְיָהוּ בַּחֲצַר המטרה וְנָתֹן לו כִּכַּר־לחם ליום	וישליכו אֹתוֹ אֶל־בֵּית המטרה וַיִּתְּנוּ[e] לו לחם אֶחָד ליום
	עד־תם כָּל־הלחם מִן־העיר	עד־תם הלחם מִן־העיר

CAPUT XXXVIII.

Verse	MT	LXX
1	שְׁפַטְיָה בֶן־מַתָּן	צְפַנְיָה (שפניה) בֶן־נָתָן
	וּפַשְׁחוּר בֶּן־מַלְכִּיָּה	Deest
	מְדַבֵּר אֶל־כָּל־הָעָם לאמר	דִּבֶּר עַל־הָעָם לאמר

[a] Vid. vs. 18. [b] καὶ εἰς τὴν χερὲθ. [c] Vid. vs. 15. [d] Targ. לְבֵית.
[e] Targ. וִיהָבִין.

2	בַּחרב בָּרעב וּבַדָּבֶר	בחרב וּברעב
	יִחְיֶה והיתה־לּוֹ נפשו לשלל	יִחְיֶה והיתה נפשו לשלל[a]
3	כֹּה אמר יהוה	כִּי כה אמר יהוה
	בְּיַד חיל מלך־בבל	בִּידֵי חיל מלך־בבל
4	ויאמרו הַשָּׂרִים אל־המלך יומת נא את־האיש הַזֶּה כי עַל־כֵּן הוא מרפא	ויאמרו אל־המלך יומת נא את־האיש ההוּא כי הוא מרפא
	הנשארים בעיר הַזֹּאת	הנשארים בעיר
	לְדַבֵּר אליהם	דִּבֵּר אליהם
	איננו דֹרֵשׁ לְשלום	איננו נִבָּא שלום
5	ויאמר המלך צִדְקִיָּהוּ הנה־הוא בְּיֶדְכֶם כִּי־אֵין המלך יוכל אֶתְכֶם דָּבָר	ויאמר המלך הנה־הוא בִּידֵיכם כי לֹא־יוכל המלך לָהֶם.
6	וַיִּקְחוּ אֶת־יִרְמְיָהוּ	Deest
	אל־הַבור׀ מלכיהו	אל־בור מלכיהו[b]
	וישלחו אֶת־יִרְמְיָהוּ בַּחֲבָלִים	וישלחו אוֹתוֹ בַּבּוֹר
	וַיִּטְבַּע יִרְמְיָהוּ בטיט	וַיְהִי בטיט
7	אִישׁ סָרִיס	Deest
	והמלך יוֹשֵׁב	והמלך הָיָה
8	ויצא עֶבֶד־מֶלֶךְ מִבֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ	ויצא אֵלָיו
	לֵאמֹר	וַיֹּאמַר
9	אֲדֹנִי הַמֶּלֶךְ הֵרֵעוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים הָאֵלֶּה את כָּל־אשר עשׂוּ לְיִרְמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא אֵת אֲשֶׁר־הִשְׁלִיכוּ אֶל־הַבּוֹר וַיָּמָת תַּחְתָּיו מפני הרעב כי אין הַלֶּחם עוד בעיר	הֲרֵעוֹתָ את אשר עָשִׂיתָ לְהָמִית אֶת־הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה מפני הרעב כי אין עוד לחם בעיר
10	את־עבד־מלך הַכּוּשִׁי	את־עבד־מלך[c]
	קח בידך	קח בְּיָדְךָ
	והעלית אֶת־יִרְמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא מן־הבור בְּטֶרֶם ימות	והעלית אוֹתוֹ מן־הבור וְלֹא (פֶּן) ימות
11	בְּיָדוֹ	Deest
	אֶל־תחת הָאוֹצָר	תחת (ה)אָרֶץ

---

[a] Vid. 21:9; 39:18. [b] Targ. לְגוּבָּא דְמַלְכִּיָּא. [c] Targ. יַת עַבְדָּא דְמַלְכָּא צִדְקִיָּה.

	בליי הסחבות ובלוי מְלָחִים	בלוי סחבות ובלוי חֲבָלִים
	וַיְשַׁלְּחֵם	וַיַּשְׁלִכֵם
	בַּחֲבָלִים	Deest
12	ויאמֶר עֶבֶד־מֶלֶךְ הַכּוּשִׁי אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ שִׂים נָא בְּלוֹאֵי הַסְּחָבוֹת וְהַמְּלָחִים תַּחַת אַצִּלוֹת יָדֶיךָ מתחת לחבלים	ויאמַר אֵלֶּה (תָ)שִׂים מתחת לחבלים
13	וימשכו אֶת־יִרְמְיָהוּ	וימשכו אוֹתוֹ
14	וישלח המלך צִדְקִיָּהוּ	וישלח המלך
	ויקח אֶת־יִרְמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא אליו אל־מָבוֹא השלישי	ויקְרָאֵהוּ אליו אל־בֵּית השלישיל[a]
	ויאמר המלך אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ	ויאמר אֵלָיו המלך
	אל־תכחד ממני דבר	וְאל־תכחד נָא ממני דבר
15	אל־צִדְקִיָּהוּ	אל־הַמֶּלֶךְ
16	וישבע המלך צִדְקִיָּהוּ אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ בַּסֵּתֶר	וישבע לוֹ המלך
	אֵת אשר עשה־לנו	אשר עשה־לנו
	ואם־אתנך בְּיַד	ואם־אתנך בִּידֵי
	אֲשֶׁר מְבַקְשִׁים אֶת־נַפְשֶׁךָ	Deest
17	ויאמר ירמיהו אֶל־צִדְקִיָּהוּ	ויאמר אֵלָיו ירמיהו
	יהוה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה
18	ואם לא־תצא אֶל־שָׂרֵי מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל וְנִתְּנָה העיר הזאת בְּיַד הכשדים	ואם לא־תצא תִּנָּתֵן העיר הזאת בִּידֵי הכשדים
	ואתה לא־תמלט מִיָּדָם	ואתה לא־תמלט
19	ויאמר המלך צִדְקִיָּהוּ	ויאמר המלך
	פן־יתנו אתי בְּיָדָם	פן־יתנו אתי בִּידֵיהֶם[b]
20	לא יִתֵּנוּ שמע־נָא בְּקוֹל יהוה לַאשר אני דבר אליך	לא יִתְּנוּךָ שמע דְּבַר[c] יהוה אשר אני דבר אליך
22	הָטְבְּעוּ בַבֹּץ רגלך נסגו אָחוֹר	הִכְשִׁילוּ בַחֲלַקּוֹת (בַּחֲלַקְלַקּוֹת) רגליך נסגו מִמֶּךָּ
23	ואת־כָּל־נשיך	ואת־נשיך

[a] Ἀσελεισήλ. [b] Targ. בִּידֵיהוֹן. [c] Targ. לְמֵימְרָא דַיְיָ.

	מִיָּדָם	Deest
	וְאֶת־הָעִיר הַזֹּאת תִּשְׂרֹף בָּאֵשׁ	וְהָעִיר הַזֹּאת תִּשָּׂרֵף
24	ויאמר צִדְקִיָּהוּ אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ איש אל־ידע בַּדברים־ האלה	ויאמר אֵלָיו הַמֶּלֶךְ איש אל־ידע מִדברים־ (מִן־הַדברים) האלה
25	וכי־ישמעו השרים הגידה־נָּא לנו מה־דִּבַּרְתָּ אֶל־ המלך ומה־דבר אֵליך	וכי השרים ישמעו הגידה לנו מה־דִּבֶּר אֵלֶיךָ המלך ומה־דבר עָליך
26	לִפְנֵי המלך בית יהונתן לָמוּת שם	לְעֵינֵי המלך אל־בית יהונתן לַהֲמִיתֵנִי שם
27	אשר צוה המלך ויחרשו מִמֶּנּוּ כי לא־נשמע הַדָּבָר	אשר צוהוּ המלך ויחרשו כי לא־ נשמע דְּבַר־יְהֹוָה
28	עד־יוֹם	עד־עֵת
	וְהָיָה כַּאֲשֶׁר נִלְכְּדָה יְרוּשָׁלִָם	Deest

CAPUT XXXIX.

1	בַּשָּׁנָה־התשעית...בחדש הָעֲשִׂרִי אֶל־ירושלם	וַיְהִי בחדש התשעי עַל־ירושלם
2	בעשתי־עשרה שנה	ובעשתי־עשרה שנה
3	נֵרְגַל שַׂרְאֶצֶר סמגר־נבו שַׂרְסְכִים רַב־סריס נֵרְגַל שַׂרְאֶצֶר רַב־ מָג וְכָל־שארית שרי מלך־ בבל	מַרְגַנְאֶצֶר וְסמגת ונבו־שָׂכָר ונְבו־ סריס נֵגַרְגַּשׁ נאצרבָּמוֹת[a] ושארית שרי מלך־בבל
4	וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר רָאָם צִדְקִיָּהוּ מֶלֶךְ־ יְהוּדָה וְכֹל אַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה וַיִּבְרְחוּ וַיֵּצְאוּ לַיְלָה מִן־הָעִיר דֶּרֶךְ גַּן הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּשַׁעַר בֵּין הַחֹמֹתָיִם וַיֵּצֵא דֶּרֶךְ הָעֲרָבָה׃	Desunt

[a] *Μαργανασὰρ καὶ Σαμαγὼθ καὶ Ναβουσάχαρ καὶ Ναβουσαρείς, Ναγαργᾶς, Νασεῤῥαβαμάθ.*

Desunt	5 וַיִּרְדְּפוּ חֵיל־כַּשְׂדִּים אַחֲרֵיהֶם וַיַּשִּׂגוּ אֶת־צִדְקִיָּהוּ בְּעַרְבוֹת יְרֵחוֹ וַיִּקְחוּ אֹתוֹ וַיַּעֲלֻהוּ אֶל־ נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל רִבְלָתָה בְּאֶרֶץ חֲמָת וַיְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ 6 מִשְׁפָּטִים׃ וַיִּשְׁחַט מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל אֶת־בְּנֵי צִדְקִיָּהוּ בְּרִבְלָה לְעֵינָיו וְאֵת כָּל־חֹרֵי יְהוּדָה שָׁחַט מֶלֶךְ 7 בָּבֶל׃ וְאֶת־עֵינֵי צִדְקִיָּהוּ עִוֵּר וַיַּאַסְרֵהוּ בַּנְחֻשְׁתַּיִם לָבִיא אֹתוֹ 8 בָּבֶלָה׃ וְאֶת־בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ וְאֶת־ בֵּית הָעָם שָׂרְפוּ הַכַּשְׂדִּים בָּאֵשׁ 9 וְאֶת־חוֹמֹת יְרוּשָׁלַםִ נָתָצוּ׃ וְאֵת יֶתֶר הָעָם הַנִּשְׁאָרִים בָּעִיר וְאֶת־ הַנֹּפְלִים אֲשֶׁר נָפְלוּ עָלָיו וְאֵת יֶתֶר הָעָם הַנִּשְׁאָרִים הֶגְלָה נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן רַב־טַבָּחִים בָּבֶל׃ 10 וּמִן־הָעָם הַדַּלִּים אֲשֶׁר אֵין־ לָהֶם מְאוּמָה הִשְׁאִיר נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן רַב־טַבָּחִים בְּאֶרֶץ יְהוּדָה וַיִּתֵּן לָהֶם כְּרָמִים וִיגֵבִים בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא׃ 11 וַיְצַו נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל עַל־ יִרְמְיָהוּ בְּיַד נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן רַב־ 12 טַבָּחִים לֵאמֹר׃ קָחֶנּוּ וְעֵינֶיךָ שִׂים עָלָיו וְאַל־תַּעַשׂ לוֹ מְאוּמָה רָּע כִּי אִם כַּאֲשֶׁר יְדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ כֵּן עֲשֵׂה 13 עִמּוֹ׃ וַיִּשְׁלַח נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן רַב־ טַבָּחִים וּנְבוּשַׁזְבָּן רַב־סָרִיס וְנֵרְגַל שַׂרְאֶצֶר רַב־מָג וְכֹל רַבֵּי מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל׃
וַיּוֹצִאֻהוּ	14 לְהוֹצִאֵהוּ אֶל־הַבָּיִת
Desunt	15 בִּהְיֹתוֹ עָצוּר 16 לֵאמֹר
כה־אמר יהוה	כה־אמר יהוה צְבָאוֹת

	אֶל־הָעִיר הזאת	עַל־הָעִיר[a] הזאת
	וְהָיוּ לְפָנֶיךָ בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא	Deest
17	נְאֻם־יְהוָה ולא תִנָּתֵן בְּיַד האנשים	ולא אֶתֶּנְךָ בידי האנשים
18	והיתה לְךָ נפשך לשלל	והיתה נפשך לשלל[b]

CAPUT XL.

1	אל־ירמיהו מאת יהוה	מאת יהוה אל־ירמיהו
	מן־הרמה בקחתו אתו וְהוּא־ אָסוּר באזקים בתוך כָּל־גלות יְרוּשָׁלַםִ ויהודה	אֲשֶׁר מן־הרמה בקחתו אתו באזקים בתוך גלות יְהודה
2	ויִּקַּח רב־טבחים לְיִרְמְיָהוּ אֶל־המקום הזה	ויִּקָּחֵהוּ (ויקח אוֹתוֹ) רב־טבחים עַל־המקום[c] הזה
3	וַיָּבֵא ויעש יהוה כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֵּר כי־חטאתם לַיהוָה	ויעש יהוה כי־חטאתם לוֹ
	וְהָיָה לָכֶם ֹדָּבָר הַזֶּה	Deest
4	וְעַתָּה הנה פתחתיך הַיּוֹם מן־ האזקים אשר על־ידך	הנה פתחתיך מן־האזקים אשר על־ידיך
	בֹּא ואשים את־ עֵינִי עליך	ואשים את־עֵינַי עליך
	וְאִם־רַע בְּעֵינֶיךָ לָבוֹא־אִתִּי בָבֶל חֲדָל רְאֵה כָּל־הָאָרֶץ לְפָנֶיךָ אֶל־טוֹב וְאֶל־הַיָּשָׁר בְּעֵינֶיךָ לָלֶכֶת שָׁמָּה לֵךְ׃	Desunt
5	ועוֹדֶנּוּ לא־יָשׁוּב וְשֻׁבָה אל־ גדליה	ואִם־לא[d] לֵךְ שב אל־גדליה
	בְּעָרֵי יהודה ושב אתו בתוך העם או אל־כל־הַיָּשָׁר בעיניך ללכת לך	בְּאֶרֶץ יהודה ושב אתו בתוך העם בְּאֶרֶץ יְהוּדָה אל־כל־הטוב בעיניך ללכת שָׁמָּה וָלֵךְ
	אֲרֻחָה וּמַשְׂאֵת	משׂאֹת[e]

[a] Targ. עַל קַרְתָּא הָדָא. [b] Vid. 21:9; 38:2. [c] Targ. עַל אַתְרָא הָדֵין.
[d] Targ. וְאִם לֵית אַתְּ צָבֵי. [e] Targ. נִבְזְבַן.

6	ויבא יִרְמְיָהוּ אל־גדליה בֶּן־אֲחִיקָם	ויבא אל־גדליה
	וישב אִתּוֹ בתוך הָעָם הנשארים בארץ	וישב בתוך עַמּוֹ הנשאר בארץ
7	כל־שרי הַחֲיָלִים	כל־שרי הַחַיִל
	בֶּן־אֲחִיקָם	Deest
	וְכִי הִפְקִיד אתו אֲנָשִׁים וְנָשִׁים וָטַף וּמִדַּלַּת הָאָרֶץ מֵאשר לא־הגלו בבל	וַיַּפְקִידוּ אתו אַנְשֵׁיהֶם וּנְשֵׁיהֶם אשר לא־הגלו בבל
8	ויבאוּ	ויבא
	יִשמעאל	ישמעאל
	וְיוֹנָתָן בְּנֵי־קרח	בֶּן־קרח[a]
9	בֶּן־אֲחִיקָם בֶּן־שָׁפָן	Deest
	מֵעֲבוֹד הכשדים	מִפְּנֵי עַבְדֵי הכשדים
10	וַאני הִנְנִי ישב במצפה	וְהִנֵּה אני ישב לִפְנֵיכֶם במצפה
	אשר יָבֹאוּ אֵלֵינוּ	אשר בָּאוּ אֲלֵיכֶם (עֲלֵיכֶם)
	ושבו בְּעָרֵיכֶם אשר־תפשתם	ושבו בֶּעָרִים אשר־תפשתם
11	וגַם כל־היהודים	וכל־היהודים
	וּבאדום ואשר בכל־הָאֲרָצוֹת	ואשר באדום ואשר בכל־הָאָרֶץ
	בֶּן־שָׁפָן	Deest
12	וַיָּשֻׁבוּ כָל־הַיְּהוּדִים מִכָּל־הַמְּקֹמוֹת אֲשֶׁר נִדְּחוּ־שָׁם ויבאו ארץ־יהודה אל־גדליהו	ויבאו אל־גדליהו ארץ־יהודה
	הרבה מאד	הרבה מאד וָשֶׁמֶן[b]
13	וכל־שרי החֲיָלִים אשר בשָּׂדֶה	וכל־שרי החַיִל אשר בשדות
14	מלך בְּנֵי־עמון שלח את־ישמעאל בֶּן־נְתַנְיָה להכֹּתְךָ נָפֶשׁ	מלך בֶּן־עמון שלח אֱלֶיךָ את־ישמעאל להכות (אֶת־) נַפְשֶׁךָ
	בֶּן־אֲחִיקָם	Deest
15	וְיוחנן בֶּן־קָרֵחַ אָמַר	וַיֹּאמֶר יוחנן
	לֵאמֹר	Desunt
	בֶּן־נְתַנְיָה	

[a] Targ. בַּר־קָרֵחַ. [b] Cf. vs. 10.

לָמה יכבֶּה נָפֶשׁ	למה יכה (אֶת־) נַפְשֶׁךָ
16 בֶּן־אֲחִיקָם	Desunt
בֶּן־קָרֵחַ	
אַל־תעשׂ אֶת־הדבר הַזֶּה	אַל־תעשׂה הדבר
אתה דבר אֶל־ישמעאל	אתה דבר עַל־[a]ישמעאל

CAPUT XLI.

1 בן־אלישָׁמָע מזרע המְּלוּכָה	בן־אלישע מזרע הַמֶּלֶךְ
וְרַבֵּי הַמֶּלֶךְ	Desunt
בֶּן־אֲחִיקָם	
בַּמִּצְפָּה	
2 בֶּן־נְתַנְיָה	
בֶּן־אֲחִיקָם בֶּן־שָׁפָן בַּחֶרֶב וַיָּמֶת אֹתוֹ	
בָּארץ	עַל־הָארץ
3 אֶת־גְּדַלְיָהוּ	Deest
ואת־הכשדים	ואת־כָּל־הכשדים
אֵת אַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה הִכָּה יִשְׁמָעֵאל	Desunt
4 לְהָמִית את־גדליהו	לַהֲמִיתוֹ (לְהַכֹּתוֹ) את־גדליהו
5 מִשִּׁלוֹ	וּמִשָּׁלֵם
שמנים אִישׁ	שמנים אֲנָשִׁים
ולבונה בְּיָדָם	ולבונה בִּידֵיהֶם[b]
6 ויצא ישמעאל בֶּן־נְתַנְיָה לקראתם מִן־הַמִּצְפָּה הֹלֵךְ הלֹךְ ובֹכֶה וַיְהִי כִּפְגֹשׁ אֹתָם ויאמר אליהם	ויצא לקראתם ישמעאל הֵמָּה הֹלְכוּ וּבָכוּ ויאמר אליהם
בֶּן־אֲחִיקָם	Deest
7 וַיִּשְׁחָטֵם יִשְׁמָעֵאל בֶּן־נְתַנְיָה אֶל־תּוֹךְ הבור הוּא וְהָאֲנָשִׁים אֲשֶׁר־אִתּוֹ	וישחטם אל־הבור

[a] Targ. עַל. [b] Targ. בִּידֵיהוֹן.

8	נמצאו־בָם	נמצאו־שָׁם
	וְשֶׁמֶן וּדְבָשׁ	דְּבַשׁ וְשֶׁמֶן
9	פִּגְרֵי הָאֲנָשִׁים	Deest
	בְּיַד־גְּדַלְיָהוּ הוּא	בּוֹר גָּדֹל הוּא (הָיָה)
	בֶּן־נְתַנְיָהוּ	Deest
10	וַיִּשְׁבְּ ישמעאל אֶת־כָּל־שְׁאֵרִית הָעָם אֲשֶׁר בַּמִּצְפָּה את־בנות המלך וְאת־כל־העם הנשארים במצפה אשר הפקיד נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן רב־טבחים	וַיָּשֶׁב ישמעאל את־כל־העם הנשארים במצפה וְאת־בנות המלך אשר הפקיד רב־טבחים
	וַיִּשְׁבֵּם יִשְׁמָעֵאל בֶּן־נְתַנְיָה	Deest
	וילך לַעֲבֹר אֶל־בני עמון	וילך לְעֵבֶר בני עמון
11	וכל־שרי הַחֲיָלִים	וכל־שרי הַחַיִל
	בֶּן־נְתַנְיָה	Deest
12	ויקחו את־כל־הָאֲנָשִׁים וילכו להלחם עם־יִשְׁמָעֵאל בֶּן־נְתַנְיָה	ויקחו את־כל־מַחֲנֵהֶם וילכו להלהם עִמּוֹ
	אֶל־מים רבים אֲשֶׁר בגבעון	עַל[a]־מים רבים בגבעון
13	בֶּן־קָרֵחַ	Deest
	כל־שרי הַחֲיָלִים	כל־שרי הַחַיִל
	וַיִּשְׂמָחוּ	Deest
14	וַיָּסֹבּוּ כָּל־הָעָם אֲשֶׁר־שָׁבָה יִשְׁמָעֵאל מִן־הַמִּצְפָּה וישבו וַיֵּלְכוּ אל־יוחנן בֶּן־קָרֵחַ	וישבו אל־יוחנן
15	בֶּן־נְתַנְיָה מִפְּנֵי יוֹחָנָן	Desunt
16	יוחנן בֶּן־קָרֵחַ וכל־שרי הַחֲיָלִים	יוחנן וכל־שרי הַחַיִל
	בֶּן־נְתַנְיָה מִן־הַמִּצְפָּה אַחַר הִכָּה אֶת־גְּדַלְיָה בֶּן־אֲחִיקָם	Desunt
	גְּבָרִים אַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה ונשים וְטַף וסריסים אשר השיב מגבעון	גִּבֹּרִים[b] בַּמִּלחמה והַנשים וְהַשְּׁאֵרִית והַסרסים אשר השיבו מגבעון
17	בגֵרוּת כִּמוֹהָם	בגִבֹרוּת(?) כמהם[c]

[a] Targ. עַל. [b] Vid. 43:6. [c] ἐν Γαβηρωχαμάα.

	ללכת לָבוֹא מצרים	ללכת מצרים
18	בֶּן־נְתַנְיָה בֶּן־אֲחִיקָם	Desunt

CAPUT XLII.

1	ויגשו כל־שרי הַחֲיָלִים ויוחנן בֶּן־קָרֵחַ וִיזַנְיָה בן־הוֹשַׁעְיָה	ויגשו כל־שרי הַחַיִל ויוחנן וַעֲזַרְיָה בן־מַעֲשֵׂיָה[a]
2	ויאמרו אל־ירמיהו הנביא	אל־ירמיהו הנביא ויאמרו אֵלָיו
	והתפלל בַּעֲדֵנוּ	והתפלל
	בעד כָּל־הַשְּׁאֵרִית הַזֹּאת	בעד הַנִּשְׁאָרִים הָאֵלֶּה
	כאשר עיניך ראות אֹתָנוּ	כאשר עיניך ראות
4	ירמיהו הַנָּבִיא	ירמיהו
	הנני מתפלל אל־יהוה אלהיכם	הנני מתפלל (אֶתפלל) בַּעַדְכֶם אל־ יהוה אלהינו
	כָּל־הדבר	הדבר
	יהוה אֶתְכֶם	יהוה אֱלֹהִים
	לא־אֶמְנַע מכם דבר	לא־אַסְתִּיר מכם דבר
5	לעד אֱמֶת ונאמן	לעד צֶדֶק ונאמן
	אשר יִשְׁלָחֲךָ יהוה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אלינו	אשר שָׁלַח יהוה אלינו
6	אם־טוב ואם־רע בְּקוֹל יהוה	וְאם־טוב ואם־רע אֶת־קול יהוה
7	וַיְהִי דבר־יהוה	הָיָה דבר־יהוה
8	בֶּן־קָרֵחַ	Deest
	כָּל־שרי הַחֲיָלִים אֲשֶׁר אִתּוֹ	שרי הַחַיִל
	לְמקטון ועד־גדול	מקטון[b] ועד־גדול
9	אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר שְׁלַחְתֶּם אֹתִי אֵלָיו לְהַפִּיל תְּחִנַּתְכֶם לְפָנָיו	Desunt
10	וּבָנִיתִי אתכם	אֶבְנֶה אתכם
	כי נִחַמְתִּי אֶל־הרעה	כי חָדַלְתִּי מִן־הרעה[c]
11	אל־תראו מִמֶּנּוּ	אל־תראו
	להושיע אתכם ולהציל אתכם מידו	להציל אתכם ולהושיע אתכם מִיָּדָם

[a] Vid. 43:2. [b] ut vs. 1. [c] Targ. אֲרֵי תָבֵית מִן בִּישְׁתָא.

12	ורחם אתכם וְהֵשִׁיב אתכם אל־אדמתכם	ורחמתִּי אתכם וְאָשִׁיב אתכם אל־אדמתכם
13	בקול יהוה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם	בקול יהוה
14	לֵאמֹר לֹא כי ארץ מצרים נבוא אֲשֶׁר לֹא־נראה מלחמה	כי ארץ מצרים נבוא וְלֹא־נראה מלחמה
	וְלַלֶּחֶם לֹא־נרעב	וּבַלֶּחֶם לֹא־נרעב
15	וְעַתָּה לכן שמעו דבר־יהוה	לכן שמעו דבר־יהוה
	שְׁאֵרִית יְהוּדָה	Deest
	יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה
	שׂוֹם תשמון פניכם לָבֹא מצרים ובאתם לגור שם	תשמון פניכם לְמִצְרַיִם[a] ובאתם שם לגור
16	אשר אתם יראים מִמֶּנָּה שָׁם תשיג אתכם	אשר אתם יראים מִפָּנֶיהָ תשיג אתכם
	אשר־אתם דאגים מִמֶּנּוּ שָׁם ידבק אחריכם מצרים	אשר־אתם דאגים מִפָּנָיו ידבק אֶתְכֶם אחריכם בְּמצרים
17	כל־האנשים אֲשֶׁר־שָׂמוּ את־פניהם לָבוֹא מצרים לגור שם	כל־האנשים וְכָל־הַנָּכְרִים (הַזָּרִים) הַשָּׂמִים את־פניהם לְאֶרֶץ מצרים לגור שם
	יָמוּתוּ בחרב ברעב וּבַדָּבֶר	יִתַּמּוּ[b] בחרב וברעב
	ולא־יהיה להם שָׂרִיד ופליט מִפְּנֵי הרעה	ולא־יהיה להם פליט מִן הרעה
18	יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה
	כאשר נִתַּךְ אַפִּי וַחֲמָתִי	כאשר נִתְּכָה חמתי
	לְאָלָה ולשמה	לשמה וְלַעֲבָדִים[c]
19	דבר יהוה	אֲשֶׁר דבר יהוה
	ידע תדעו כִּי־הַעִידֹתִי בָכֶם הַיּוֹם	וְעַתָּה ידע תדעו[d]
20	כי הִתְעֵתֶּם בנפשותיכם כִּי־אַתֶּם שְׁלַחְתֶּם אתי אֶל־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם לאמר התפלל בַּעֲדֵנוּ אל־יהוה אֱלֹהֵינוּ וככל אשר יאמר יהוה אֱלֹהֵינוּ כֵּן הַגֶּד־לָנוּ וְעָשִׂינוּ	כי הֲרֵעוֹתֶם בנפשותיכם שְׁלַחִים. אתי לאמר התפלל עָלֵינוּ[e] אל־יהוה וככל אשר יאמר אֵלֶיךָ יהוה נַעֲשֶׂה

[a] Targ. לְמִצְרַיִם. [b] Cf. 14:15; 44:12. [c] ὑποχείριοι. [d] ut vs. 22.
[e] Targ. צַלִּי עֲלָנָא.

21	וָאַגִּד לָכֶם הַיּוֹם ולא שמעתם בקול יהוה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וּלְכֹל אשר־שלחני אליכם	ולא שמעתם בקול יהוה אשר־שלחני אליכם
22	ועתה יָדֹעַ תֵּדְעוּ כִּי בחרב ברעב וּבַדֶּבֶר תָּמוּתוּ	ועתה בחרב וברעב תִּתַּמּוּ[a]

CAPUT XLIII.

1	לדבר אל־כָּל־העם את־כל־דברי יהוה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם אשר שלחו יהוה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם	לדבר אל־העם את־כל־דברי יהוה אשר שלחו יהוה
2	בן־הוֹשַׁעְיָה	בן־מַעֲשֵׂיָה[b]
	הַזֵּדִים	Deest
	אמרים אל־ירמיהו שקר אַתָּה מְדַבֵּר לא שלחך יהוה אֱלֹהֵינוּ	הָאמרים אל־ירמיהו לֵאמֹר שקר לא־שלחך יהוה אֵלֵינוּ
3	כי	כי אִם
	בְּיַד־הכשדים	בִּידֵי־הכשדים
4	בֶּן־קָרֵחַ	Deest
	וכל־שרי הַחֲיָלִים	וכל־שרי הַחַיִל
5	בֶּן־קָרֵחַ	Deest
	וכל־שרי הַחֲיָלִים	וכל־שרי הַחַיִל
	מִכָּל־הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר נִדְּחוּ־שָׁם	Deest
	לגור בְּאֶרֶץ יְהוּדָה	לגור בָּאָרֶץ
6	את־הַגְּבָרִים	את־הַגִּבֹּרִים[c]
	ואת־הטַּף	ואת־הטַּף הַנִּשְׁאָרִים
	ואת כָּל־הַנֶּפֶשׁ אשר הניח נבוזראדן רַב־טַבָּחִים	ואת הַנְּפָשׁוֹת[d] אשר הניח נבוזראדן
	בֶּן־שָׁפָן	Deest
7	ויבאו אֶרֶץ מצרים	ויבאו מצרים
9	קח בְּיָדְךָ	קח־לְךָ[e]

[a] Cf. 14:15; 44:12. [b] Vid. 42:1. [c] Vid. 41:16. [d] Targ. כָּל נַפְשָׁתָא.
[e] Targ. סַב עִמָּךְ.

	וטמנתם בַּמֶּלֶט בַּמַּלְבֵּן אֲשֶׁר בְּפֶתַח בית־פרעה	וטמנתם בְּאֻלַמִּים[a] (בְּ)שַׁעַר בית פרעה
	אֲנָשִׁים יהודִים	אַנְשֵׁי יהודָה
10	ואמרת אֲלֵיהֶם	ואמרת
	יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה
	וְלָקַחְתִּי את־נבוכדראצר מלך־בבל עַבְדִּי וְשַׂמְתִּי כסאו	וְהֵבֵאתִי את־נבוכדראצר מלך־בבל וְיָשֵׂם כסאו
	אשר טמנתי ונטה את־שַׁפְרוּרוֹ	אשר טמנת ונטל (ונשא) הַגֵּשֶׁק
11	ובאה	ובא
12	והצתי אש בבתי אלהי מִצְרַיִם	והצית אש בבתי אלהיהם
	ועטה את־ארץ מצרים כאשר־יעטה הרעה את־בגדו ויצא מִשָּׁם בשלום	ועדה[b] את־ארץ מצרים כאשר־יעדה[c] הרעה את־בגדו ויצא בשלום
13	בֵּית שמש אשר בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם ואת־בתי אֱלֹהֵי־מִצְרָיִם	עִיר שמש אשר בְּאוֹן ואת־בתיהם

CAPUT XLIV.

1	הישבים במגדל	וְהישבים במגדל
	וּבְנֹף	Deest
2	יהוה צְבָאוֹת	יהוה
	ועל כָּל־ערי יהודה והנם חָרְבָּה הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְאֵין בָּהֶם יושב	ועל־ערי יהודה והנם חֳרָבוֹת מֵאֵין יושב
3	לַעֲבֹד	Deest
	אשר לא יְדָעוּם הֵמָּה אַתֶּם וַאֲבֹתֵיכֶם	אשר לא יְדַעְתֶּם
4	את־כָּל־עבדי	את־עבדי
	וְשָׁלֹחַ	וָאֶשְׁלַח
	אל־נָא תעשו	אל־תעשו
5	ולא שמעו	ולא שמעו אֵלַי
6	בְּעָרֵי יהודה וּבְחֻצוֹת ירושלם	בְּשַׁעֲרֵי יהודה וּמִחוּץ[d] ירושלם

[a] ἐν προθύροις. [b] καὶ φθειριεῖ.—Targ. וְירוֹקֵן. [c] ὥσπερ φθειρίζει.
[d] ἔξωθεν.—Vid. vss. 9, 17, 21.

לחרבָּה לשממה	לחרבות וְלשממה
7 יהוה אֱלֹהֵי צבאות אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	יהוה צבאות
אֶל־נפשתכם	עַל־[a](בְּ)נפשתכם
לבלתי הוֹתִיר לכם שְׁאֵרִית	לבלתי הִוָּתֵר לכם (מִכֶּם) אִישׁ
8 למען הַכְרִית לָכֶם	למען תִּכָּרֵתוּ
9 ואת רעות נָשָׁיו וְאֵת רָעֹתֵיכם	ואת רעות נְשִׂיאֵיכם (שָׂרֵיכם)
וּבְחֻצוֹת ירושלם	וּמִחוּץ[b] ירושלם
10 לא דֻכְּאוּ	לא חָדְלוּ[c]
וְלֹא יָרְאוּ ולא־הָלְכוּ בתוֹרָתִי	ולא־הֶחֱזִיקוּ (תָמְכוּ) במִצְוֹתַי
לִפְנֵיכֶם וְלִפְנֵי אבותיכֶם	לפני אבותיהֶם
11 לכן כה־אמר יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי	לכן כה־אמר יהוה הנני שם פני
יִשְׂרָאֵל הנני שם פני בָּכֶם לְרָעָה	
וּלְהַכְרִית אֶת־כָּל־יְהוּדָה	
12 וְלָקַחְתִּי את־שְׁאֵרִית יְהוּדָה	לְאַבֵּד את־כָּל־הַנִּשְׁאָרִים אשר
אשר־שָׂמוּ פְנֵיהֶם לָבוֹא אֶרֶץ־	בְּמצרים וְיִפְּלוּ בחרב וּברעב
מצרים לָגוּר שָׁם וְתַמּוּ כל	וְיִתמו מקטן עד־גדול
בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם יִפֹּלוּ בחרב	
בּרעב יתמו מקטן וְעד־גדול	
בַּחֶרֶב וּבָרָעָב יָמֻתוּ	Deest
והיו לְאָלָה לְשמה ולקללה	והיו לחרפה וּלשמה ולקללה
וּלחרפה	
13 וּבַדָּבֶר	Deest
14 ולא יהיה פליט וְשָׂרִיד לִשׁארית	ולא יהיה כָּל־פליט מִשּׁארית
יהודה הַבָּאִים לָגוּר־שָׁם	יהודת הַגָּרִים בארץ מצרים
בארץ מצרים וְלשוב ארץ	לשוב ארץ יהודה אשר־
יהודה אשר־המה מנשאים	מנשאים המה בְּנפשוֹתֵיהֶם[d]
אֶת־נפשָׁם לשוב לָשֶׁבֶת שם	לשוב שם לא־ישובו
כִּי לא־ישובו	
15 לֵאלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים	Desunt {
הָעֹמְדוֹת	
17 אשר־יָצָא מפינו	אשר־יָצָא מפינו
מלכינו	וּמלכינו

---

[a] Targ. עַל. [b] Vid. vss. 6, 17, 21. [c] Targ. לָא פְסַקוּ. [d] ἐλπίζουσι ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὐτῶν

	ובחצות ירושלם	ומחוץ ירושלם[a]
18	ומן־אז חדלנו	וכאשר חדלנו
	והסך־לה נסכים	Deest
19	מקטרים	הקטרתי
	ולהסך לה נסכים	ומנסכים[b] לה נסכים
	להעצבה	Deest
	והסך לה נסכים	וסכנו לה נסכים
20	על־הגברים ועל־הנשים ועל־כל־העם הענים אתו דבר	אל־הגברים ואל־הנשים[c] ואל־כל־העם הענים אתו דברים
21	ובחצות ירושלם	ומחוץ לירושלם
	מלכיכם	ומלכיכם
	אתם זכר יהוה	זכר יהוה
22	מפני התועבת	ומתועבתיכם (ומן־התועבת)
	ותהי ארצכם לחרבה	ותהי ארצכם לחרבות[d]
	מאין יושב	Deest
23	ובתרתו ובחקתיו	ובחקתיו ובתרתו (ובעדותו)
	על־כן קראת אתכם הרעה הזאת	ותקראנה אתכם הרעות האלה
	כיום הזה	Deest
24	אל־כל־העם ואל כל־הנשים	אל־העם ואל־הנשים
	כל־יהודה אשר בארץ מצרים	Deest
25	כה־אמר יהוה־צבאות אלהי ישראל לאמר אתם ונשיכם ותדברנה בפיכם ובידיכם מלאתם	כה־אמר יהוה אלהי ישראל אתן הנשים בפיכן דברתן ובידיכן מלאתן
	ועשה תעשינה את־נדריכם	ועשה תעשינה
26	אם־יהיה עוד שמי נקרא בפי כל־איש יהודה אמר חי־אדני יהוה	אם־יהיה עוד שמי בפי כל־יהודה אמר חי־יהוה
27	הנני שקד עליהם לרעה ולא לטובה ותמו כל־איש יהודה אשר בארץ מצרים	כי אני שקד עליהם להרע להם ולא להיטיב ותמו כל־יהודה היושבים בארץ מצרים
28	מן־ארץ מצרים	Deest

[a] Vid. vss. 6, 9, 21. [b] Targ. ומנסכן. [c] Targ. לגבריא ולנשיא. [d] Vid. vs. 6.

	וידעו כָּל־שארית יהודה הַבָּאִים לְארץ־מצרים	וידעו שארית יהודה הָעֹמְדִים בְּארץ־מצרים
	מִמֶּנִּי וּמֵהֶם	Deest
29	וזאת לכם האות נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה כִּי־פקד אני עליכם בַּמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה לְמַעַן תֵּדְעוּ כִּי קוֹם יָקוּמוּ דְבָרַי עֲלֵיכֶם לרעה	וזאת האות לכם כִּי־פקד אני עליכם לרעה
30	אֶת־פַּרְעֹה חפרע	את־חפרע
	בְּיַד אֹיְבָיו וּבְיַד מבקְשֵׁי נפשו	בִּידֵי איבוֹ וּבִידֵי מבקֵּשׁ נפשו
	בְּיַד נבוכדראצר	בִּידֵי נבוכדראצר

CAPUT XLV.

1	עַל־ספר	בַּספר
	לֵאמֹר	Deest
2	כה־אמר יהוה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	כה־אמר יהוה
3	אמרת אוי־נָא לִי כִּי־יָסַף יהוה יָגוֹן עַל־מכאבִי יָגַעְתִּי בְּאַנְחָתִי ומנוחה לא מצאתי	כִּי (יַעַן) אמרת אוי לי אוֹי לִי כִּי־יסף יהוה יָגוֹן מכאב לִי (?) יָצַעְתִּי (שָׁכַבְתִּי) בַּאֲנָחוֹת מנוחה לא מצאתי
4	כֹּה תֹאמַר אליו	אֱמֹר אליו
	וְאֶת־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ הִיא	Deest
	ונתתי לְךָ את־נפשך לשלל עַל כָּל־הַמְּקֹמוֹת אשר תלך־שם	ונתת את־נפשך לשלל בְּכל־הַמָּקוֹם אשר תלך־שם

CAPUT XLVI.

1	אֲשֶׁר היה דְבַר־יְהוָֹה אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא עַל־הַגּוֹיִם	בְּרֵאשִׁית מַלְכוּת צִדְקִיָּהוּ מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה היה הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה לְעֵילָם
2	בכרְכְּמִשׁ	בכרמש[a]
	נבוכדרֶאצר	נבוכדנֶאצר[b]

---

[a] ἐν Χαρμείς. [b] Targ. נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר.

ליהויקים בֶּן־יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ	ליהויקים
3 עִרְכוּ מגן וצִנָּה	הַחֲזיקו (תִּפְשׂוּ) מגן (נֶשֶׁק) וצִנּוֹת[a]
אסרו הסוסים וַעֲלוּ הפרשים והתיצבו בכובעים מִרְקוּ הרמחים לִבְשׁוּ הַסִּרְיֹנֹת	וְאסרו הסוסים עלו הפרשים והתיצבו בכובעֵיכֶם זִרְקוּ (הָרִיקוּ) הרמחים וְלִבְשׁוּ סריֹנֹתֵיכֶם
5 מדוע רָאִיתִי המה חתים נסוגים אחור וְגבוריהם יכתו וּמנוס נסו	מדוע המה חתים וּנסוגים אחור כִּי גבוריהם יכתו מנוס נסו
6 צפוֹנָה על־יד נְהַר־פרת כשלו	עַל־צפון על־יד פרת כשלו
7 כנהרות יתגעשו מֵימָיו	וְכנהרות יתגעשו מָיִם[b]
8 מצרים כיאור יעלה	מֵי מצרים כיאור יעלה
וְכַנְּהָרוֹת יִתְגֹּעֲשׁוּ מָיִם	Deest
אעלה אכסה־אֶרֶץ אבידה עִיר וְישבי־בה	אעלה וַאכסה־הָאָרֶץ וְאבידה ישבי־בה
9 עלו הסוסים והתהֹלְלוּ הָרֶכֶב וְיֵצְאוּ הַגִּבּוֹרִים כּוּשׁ וּפוּט תֹּפְשֵׂי מגן ולודים תֹּפְשֵׂי דֹּרְכֵי קשת	עלו עַל־הסוסים והתכּוֹנְנוּ הַמִּרְכָּבוֹת[c] צאו גבורֵי־כוּשִׁים[d] וְלוּבִים תֹּפְשֵׂי מגן ולודים עָלוּ דֹּרְכֵי קשת
10 לאדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה צְבָאוֹת	ליהוָֹה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
להנקם מִצָּרָיו ואכלה חרב	להנקם מֵאוֹיְבָיו ואכלה חרב יְהוָֹה[e]
לאדני יֱהוִֹה צְבָאוֹת בְּארץ צפון אֶל־נהר־פרת	לאדני מֵארץ צפון עַל־נהר־פרת
11 בתולת בת־מצרים לשוא הרביתי רפאות תעלה אין לָךְ	לִבתולת בת־מצרים לשוא הרביתי רפאוּתַיִךְ תעלה אין בָּךְ
12 שמעו גוים קְלוֹנֵךְ	שמעו גוים קוֹלֵךְ
כשלו יַחְדָּיו	כשלו יַחַד
13 הַדָּבָר אשר דבר יהוה אֶל־ירמיהו הַנָּבִיא לָבוֹא נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מלך בבל	אשר דבר יהוה בְּיַד־ירמיהו בְּבוֹא מלך בבל
14 הגידו בְמִצְרַיִם וְהַשְׁמִיעוּ במגדול והשמיעו בְנֹף וּבְתַחְפַּנְחֵס	הגידו לְ(ב)מגדול והשמיעו אֶל־(ב)מֹף[g]

---

[a] Targ. וּתְרֵיסִין. [b] ut vs. 8. [c] Targ. וְתִדִּכָּא. [d] Targ. בּוּכָּאֵי.
[e] Cf. I. Chron. 21:12. [f] Targ. עַל. [g] Vid. vs. 19.—Targ. בְּכָפִּים.

	כִּי־אכלה חרב סְבִיבֶיךָ	כִּי־אכלה חרב סְבָבֶיךָ
15	מדוע נִסְחַף אַבִּירֶיךָ	מדוע נָס מִמְּךָ (— מְךָ) אַפִּיס עֶגֶל בְּחִירְךָ
16	הִרְבָּה כּוֹשֵׁל גַּם־נָפַל אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ וַיֹּאמְרוּ קוּמָה מפני חרב הַיּוֹנָה	מַרְבִּיתְךָ (הָרַבָּה) כָּשַׁל גַּם־נָפַל וְאִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ אָמַר נָקוּם מפני חרב הַיְוָנָה (הַיְּוָנִית)
17	קָרְאוּ שָׁם פרעה מֶלֶךְ־מצרים שָׁאוֹן הֶעֱבִיר הַמּוֹעֵד	קִרְאוּ שֵׁם פרעה נְכֹה מֶלֶךְ־מצרים שָׁאוֹן הִשְׁבִּי(ת) (ה)מּוֹעֵד[a]
18	נְאֻם־הַמֶּלֶךְ יְהוָֹה צְבָאוֹת שְׁמוֹ	נְאֻם־אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה
19	כִּי־נֹף	כִּי־מֹף[b]
	וְנִצְּתָה מֵאֵין יוֹשֵׁב	וְנִקְרָא אוֹי מֵאֵין יוֹשֵׁב בָּהּ
20	קֶרֶץ מִצָּפוֹן בָּא בָא	קֶרֶץ מִצָּפוֹן בָּא בָהּ[c]
21	כְּעֶגְלֵי מַרְבֵּק	כְּעֶגְלֵי מַרְבֵּק מְגֻדָּלִים בְּתוֹכָהּ
	נָסוּ יַחְדָּיו	וְנָסוּ יַחְדָּיו
	כִּי יוֹם אֵידָם בָּא עֲלֵיהֶם עֵת פְּקֻדָּתָם	כִּי יוֹם אֵיד בָּא עֲלֵיהֶם וְעֵת פְּקֻדָּתָם
22	קוֹלָהּ כַּנָּחָשׁ יֵלֵךְ כִּי־בְחַיִל יֵלֵכוּ וּבְקַרְדֻּמּוֹת בָּאוּ לָהּ כְּחֹטְבֵי עֵצִים:	קוֹלָם כַּנָּחָשׁ יְלַל כִּי־בְחוֹל יֵלֵכוּ בְּקַרְדֻּמּוֹת בָּאוּ עָלֶיהָ: כְּחֹטְבֵי[d] עֵצִים
23	כִּי לֹא יֵחָקֵר כִּי רַבּוּ מֵאַרְבֶּה	כִּי לֹא יִדַּמֶּה כִּי רַב מֵאַרְבֶּה
24	נִתְּנָה בְּיַד עַם־צָפוֹן	נִתְּנָה בִּידֵי עַם־צָפוֹן
25	אָמַר יְהוָֹה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הִנְנִי פוֹקֵד אֶל־אָמוֹן מִנֹּא וְעַל־פַּרְעֹה וְעַל־מִצְרַיִם וְעַל־אֱלֹהֶיהָ וְעַל־מְלָכֶיהָ וְעַל־פַּרְעֹה וְעַל הַבֹּטְחִים בּוֹ	הִנְנִי פוֹקֵד אֶת־אָמוֹן בְּנָהּ עַל־פַּרְעֹה וְעַל הַבֹּטְחִים בּוֹ
26	וּנְתַתִּים בְּיַד מְבַקְשֵׁי נַפְשָׁם וּבְיַד נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל וּבְיַד עֲבָדָיו וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵן תִּשְׁכֹּן כִּימֵי־קֶדֶם נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה:	Desunt
27	מֵאֶרֶץ שִׁבְיָם	מִשְּׁבִים

[a] Σαὼν Ἐσβεὶ Μωήδ. [b] Vid. vs. 14. [c] Targ. יֵיתוּן עֲלַהּ. [d] Inc. vs. 23.

	וּשַׁאֲנַן ואין מחריד	וְיָשַׁן ואין מחריד אוֹתוֹ
28	אַתָּה אל־תירא	אל־תירא
	כי אתך אני כי אעשה כלה	כי אתך אני הַבְּמְחָה וְהָעֲדִינָה
	בכל־הַגּוֹיִם	(יַהַמְעֻנָּגָה) סֻגָּרָה כי אעשה
		לְעַם כלה בכל־גוי
	ויסרתיך לַמשפט	ויסרתיך לְמשפט

CAPUT XLVII.

1	אֲשֶׁר הָיָה דְבַר־יְהוָֹה אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ	עַל־[a]פלשתים
	הַנָּבִיא אֶל־פלשתים בְּטֶרֶם	
	יַכֶּה פַרְעֹה אֶת־עַזָּה	
2	וזעקו הָאָדָם והילל כל יוֹשֵׁב	וזעקו הָאֲנָשִׁים[b] והיללו כל יוֹשְׁבֵי
	הארץ	הארץ[c]
3	מקול שעטת פרסות אַבִּירָיו	מקול שַׁעֲטָתוֹ (שְׁאוֹנוֹ) מִפַּרְסוֹת
	מרעש לרכבו	רַגְלָיו וּמרעש לרכביו[d]
	לא־הפנו אבות אל־בָּנִים מרפיון	לא־הפנו אבות אל־בְּנֵיהֶם מרפיון
	יָדָיִם	יְדֵיהֶם
4	עַל־הַיּוֹם הבא לִשְׁדוֹד את־כל־	בַּיּוֹם הבא לְאַבֵּד (לְכַלּוֹת) את־כל־
	פלשתים לְהַכְרִית לְצֹר וּלְצִידוֹן	פלשתים וְאַכְרִית (וַאֲכַלֶּה) צר
	כֹּל שָׂרִיד עֹזֵר כי־שדד יהוה	וְצִידוֹן וְכֹל הַשְּׂרִידִים עֹזְרָם
	את־פְּלִשְׁתִּים שארית אי	(עֶזְרָתָם) כי־שדד יהוה את־
	כַפְתּוֹר	שארית הָאִיִּים
5	באה קרחה אֶל־עזה נִדְמתה	באה קרחה עַל־עזה נִרְמתה
	אשקלון שארית עִמְקָם עד	אשקלון וּשארית עֲנָקִים:[e] עד־[f]
	מתי תִּתְגּוֹדָדִי:	מתי תְּגַדֵּעִי[g]
6	הוֹי חרב לַיהוה	חרב יְהוה
	הרגעי ודֹמי	הרגעי ורֹמי
7	איך תשקטי	איך תשקט

---

[a] Targ. עַל [b] Targ. בְּנֵי אֱנָשָׁא. [c] Targ. וִילַלְלוּן כָּל יָתְבֵי אַרְעָא. [d] Targ. לִרְתִיכוֹהִי. [e] Ἐνακίμ.—Targ. תּוּקְפְּהוֹן. [f] Inc. vs. 6. [g] Aram. תְּגֹדִי.

	אֶל־אשקלון ואֶל־חוֹף הים שָׁם יְעָדָהּ	עַל[a]־אשקלון ועַל[b]־חֹפֵי הים כַּל־ שְׁאָר יִעָרָה

CAPUT XLVIII.

1	כה־אמר יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הוי אֶל־נבו כי שדדה הֹבִישָׁה נלכדה קריתים הבישה הַמִּשְׂגָּב וָחָתָּה	כה־אמר יהוה הוי עַל[c]־נבו כי שדדה נלכדה קריתים הבישה חֲמָת וָגָת (וַחֲגָת)[d]
2	אין עוד תהִלַּת מואב בחשבון חָשְׁבוּ עליה רעה לְכוּ וְנכריתנה מגוי גַּם־מַדְמֵן תדמי	אין עוד תְּעָלַת מואב תהִלָּה בחשבון חִשַּׁב עליה רעה נכריתנה מגוים וְדֹם תדמי
3	קול צְעָקָה	כִּי קול צֹעֲקִים
4	הִשמיעו זְעָקָה צְעִוֹרֶיהָ	הַשמיעו צוֹעֲרָה[e]
5	כי מַעֲלֵה הלחוֹת בבכי יעלה־ בֶּכִי כִּי במוֹרַד חורנים צָרֵי צעקת־שבר שָׁמֵעוּ	מָלְאָה הלחות בבכי יעלה־ בֶּכֶה בדרךְ חורנים צעקת־שבר שְׁמַעְתֶּם
6	נסו מלטו נַפְשְׁכֶם ותהיינה כַּעֲרוֹעֵר במדבר	נסו וּמלטו נפשותיכם ותהיינה כְּעָרוֹד במדבר[f]
7	בְּמַעֲשַׂיִךְ וּבְאוֹצְרוֹתַיִךְ כֹּהֲנָיו	בְּמָעֻזַּיִךְ וְכֹהֲנָיו
8	ויבא שֹׁדֵד אֶל־כל־עיר וְעִיר אשר אמר יהוה	ויבא שד עַל[g]־כל־עיר כַּאשר אמר יהוה
9	תנו־ציץ למואב כי נָצֹא תֵּצֵא ועריה לשמה תהיינה מֵאֵין יושב בָּהֵן	תנו ציון למואב כי נצֹת תִּצַּת וְכָל־עריה לשמה תהיינה מֵאֵין יושב בה
10	וְאָרוּר	Deest
11	מִנְּעוּרָיו ושקט הוא אֶל־שְׁמָרָיו	מִנֹּעַר ושקט הוא עַל־כְּבוֹדוֹ (שְׁמוֹ?)
12	הנה־ימים באים וכליו יָרִיקוּ וְנִבְלֵיהֶם יְנַפֵּצוּ	הנה־יָמָיו באים[h] וכליו יָדִיקוּ וקַרְנָיו יְקַצֵּצוּ (יְגַדֵּעוּ)[i]

---

[a] Targ. וְעַל. [b] Targ. עַל. [c] Cf. 50:27.—Targ. עַל. [d] Ἀμὰθ καὶ Ἀγάθ. [e] Cf. Isa. 15:5.—*Ζογόρα*. [f] Cf. Job 39:5. [g] Targ. עַל. [h] Cf. 50:27, 31. [i] Cf. vs. 25.

13	מבטחם	מבטחם בְּבָטְחָם (בִּבְטֹחַ) בָּהֶם
14	ואַנְשֵׁי חיל למלחמָה	ואִישׁ חיל למלחמוֹת
15	וְעָרֶיהָ עָלָה	עִירָהּ (עִירוֹ)
	נְאֻם־הַמֶּלֶךְ יְהוָֹה צְבָאוֹת שְׁמוֹ	Deest
16	קרוב אֵיד־מואב לבוא ורעתו מִהֲרָה מאד	קרוב עֵת־מואב לבוא ורעתו מְהֵרָה[a] מאד
17	וְכֹל יֹדְעֵי שמו	כל הוֹדִיעוּ שמו
18	יֹשֶׁבֶת בְצָמָא ישבת בַּת־דִּיבוֹן כי שֹׁדֵד מואב עלה בך שִׁחֵת מבצריִד	וּשׁבי בִּבִצָּה יֹשֶׁבֶת דיבון בָּתָ(ה)[b] כי שֻׁדַּד מואב עלה בך מַשְׁחִית מבצרךְ
19	אֶל־דרך עמדי וצפי יושבת ערוער שאלי־נס ונמלטָה אמרי מה־נהיתה	עַל[c]־דרך עמדי וצפי יושבת בַּערוער[d] וְשאלי־נס ונמלט וְאמרוּ מה־נהיתה
20	הלילוּ וזעקוּ הגידו בארנון	הלילִי וזעקי הגידִי בארנון
21	ומשפט בָּא אל־ארץ הַמִּישֹׁר אֶל־חלון ואֶל־יַהְצָה וְעַל־מוֹפעת	ומשפט יָבֹא אל־ארץ מישר[e] עַל־חלון וְרִיפַת וּמוֹפעת
22	ועל־בית דִּבְלתים	ועל־בית דִּלתים
24	ועל כל־ערי אֶרֶץ מואב	ועל כל־ערי מואב
25	נְאֻם יְהוָֹה	Deest
26	וספק מואב בקִיאו	וספק מואב בכַפּוֹ[f]
27	ואם לוא הַשְּׂחוֹק היה לך ישראל אִם־בגנבים נמצאה כי־מִדֵּי דְבָרֶיךָ בו תִּתְנוֹדָד	ואם לוא לשחק[g] היה לך ישראל וּבגנבַיִךְ נמצא כי נִלְחַמְתְּ בו
28	עִזבו ערים וְשִׁכְנוּ בַּסֶּלַע ישבי מואב וִהְיוּ כְּיוֹנָה תקנֵן בְּעֶבְרֵי פִי־פחת	עָזבו הֶערים וְשָׁכנו בִּסְלָעִים ישבי מואב הָיוּ כיוֹנִים תקנֵנָה בסַלְעֵי (בצוּרֵי) פִי־פחת
29	שמענוּ גאון־מואב גֵּאֶה מאד גָּבְהוֹ וּגאונו וגאותו וְרֻם לבו	וְשמעתִּי (וָאֶשְׁמַע) גאון־מואב גָּאָה מאד גאונו וגאותו וְרָם לבו
30	אני ידעתי נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה עֶבְרָתוֹ וְלֹא־כֵן בַּדָּיו לֹא־כן עשׂוּ	וַאני ידעתי עֲבֹדָתוֹ[h] הֲלֹא בְדַיּוֹ לֹא־כן עָשָׂה
31	על־כן על־מואב אֲיֵלִיל וּלְמוֹאָב	על־כן למואב הֵילִילוּ[i] מִסָּבִיב

[a] Targ. מוֹחָיָא. [b] ἐκτριβήσεται. [c] Targ. עַל אוֹרְחָא. [d] Targ. בַּעֲרוֹעֵר. [e] Μεισώρ. [f] *καὶ ἐπικρούσει Μωὰβ ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ.* [g] ut vs. 26. [h] Targ. עוֹבָדֵי רַבְרְבָנֵיהוֹן. [i] Targ. מְיַלְּלִין.

	כֻּלֹּה אֶזְעָק אֶל־אַנְשֵׁי קִיר־חֶרֶשׂ יֶהְגֶּה	הַזְעִיקוּ[a] (זַעֲקוּ) עַל[b]־אַנְשֵׁי קִיר־חָדָשׁ, חרש[c]
32	מִבְּכִי יעזר אבכה־לך הגפן שִׂבְמָה עַד יָם יעזר נגעו על־קיצך וְעַל־בְּצִירֵךְ שֹׁדֵד נפל	כִּבְכִי[d] יעזר אבכה־לך הגפן עֲזְרֵמָה[e] עִיר יעזר (עָרֵי מִיעזר) נגעו על־קיצך על־בִּצְרֵיךְ שד נפל
33	וְנֶאֶספה שמחה וגיל מִכַּרְמֶל וּמֵאֶרֶץ מואב ויין מִיקָבִים הִשְׁבַּתִּי לֹא־יִדְרֹךְ הֵידָד הֵידָד לֹא הֵידָד	נאספה שמחה וגיל ממואב ויין הָיָה בִּיקָבֶיךָ הַשְׁכֵּם (הַשַּׁחַר) לֹא דָרְכוּ וּבָעֶרֶב לֹא עָשׂוּ הֵמָּה[f] (הידד)
34	עַד־אֶלְעָלֵה עַד־יַהַץ נתנו קולם עֶגְלַת שלשיה כי גם־מי נִמְרִים לִמְשַׁמּוֹת יהיו	עַד־אֵיתָם עָרֵיהֶם נתנו קולם וְעגלת(?) שלשיה[g] כי גם־מי נִבְרִים לְמִשְׂרֵפוֹת יהיו
35	והשבתי לְמואב מַעֲלֶה במה ומקטיר לאלהיו	והשבתי אֶת־מואב מַעֲלִים בָּמָה ומקטירים לאלהיו
36	על־כן לִבִּי לְמואב כחללים יֶהֱמֶה וְלִבִּי אֶל־אַנְשֵׁי קִיר־חֶרֶשׂ כַּחֲלִלִים יהמה על־כן יתרת עשה אָבָדוּ	על־כן לֵב מואב כחללים יהמו[h] לבי עַל[i]־אנשי קיר־חָדָשׁ[k] כְּחָלִיל יהמה על־כן יתרת עשה אבדו מֵאָדָם (מֵאֱנוֹשׁ)[l]
37	כִּי כל־ראש קָרְחָה עַל כל־ידים גדדת ועל־מתנים שק	כל־ראש בְּכָל־מָקוֹם יִקָּרְחוּ וְכל־ידים גדדת ועל־כָּל־מתנים שק
38	על כל־גגות מואב וּבִרְחֹבֹתֶיהָ כֻּלֹּה מִסְפֵּד כי־שברתי אֶת־מוֹאָב ככלי אין־חפץ בו נאם־יהוה	וְעל כל־גגות מואב וְעַל־רחבתיה כי־שברתי נאם־יהוה ככלי אין־חפץ בו
39	הֵילִילוּ	Deest
40	כי־כה אמר יהוה הִנֵּה כַנֶּשֶׁר יִדְאֶה וּפָרַשׂ כְּנָפָיו אֶל־מוֹאָב	כי־כה אמר יהוה

[a] Targ. מְצַוְּחִין. [b] Targ. עַל. [c] *κειράδας αὐχμοῦ* (חֶרֶס=חֶרֶשׂ).—Vid. vs. 36. [d] Targ. ...... כְּמָא. [e] Ἀσερημά. [f] *αἶδε.* [g] *ἀγγελίαν Σαλασία.* [h] Targ. עַל כֵּן בְּלִבְהוֹן מוֹאֲבָאֵי כִּבְנוֹרָא הָמֵן. [i] Targ. עַל. [k] Vid. vs. 31. [l] Cf. Deut. 32:26; Hos. 9:12.

41	וְהָיָה לֵב גִּבּוֹרֵי מוֹאָב בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא כְּלֵב אִשָּׁה מְצֵרָה	Desunt
43	פַּחַד וָפַחַת וָפָח נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	פַּח ופחד ופַחַת Deest
44	ילכד בפח כי־אביא אליה אֶל־ מואב שנת פקדתם נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	וְילכד בפח כי־אביא אלה עַל־[a] מואב בִּשְׁנַת[b] פקדתם
45	בְּצֵל חֶשְׁבּוֹן עָמְדוּ מִכֹּחַ נָסִים כִּי־אֵשׁ יָצָא מֵחֶשְׁבּוֹן וְלֶהָבָה מִבֵּין סִיחֹן וַתֹּאכַל פְּאַת מוֹאָב	Desunt
46	וְקָדְקֹד בְּנֵי שָׁאוֹן׃ אוֹי־לְךָ מוֹאָב אָבַד עַם־כְּמוֹשׁ כִּי־לֻקְּחוּ בָנֶיךָ	
47	בַּשֶּׁבִי וּבְנֹתֶיךָ בַּשִּׁבְיָה׃ וְשַׁבְתִּי שְׁבוּת־מוֹאָב בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה עַד־הֵנָּה מִשְׁפַּט מוֹאָב׃	

CAPUT XLIX.

1	הבנים אין לְישראל אם־יורש אין לוֹ מדוע ירש מַלְכָּם את־ גָּד ועמּוֹ בעָרָיו ישב	הבנים אין בְּישראל אם־יורש אין לָהֶם מדוע ירש מִלְכֹּל (מִלְכֹּם)[c] את־גִּלְעָד ועַמָּם בעָרֵיהֶם ישב
2	והשמעתי אֶל־רבת בְּנֵי־עַמּוֹן תרועת מלחָמָה והָיְתָה לְתֵל שממה ובְנֹתיה באש תצתנה וירש ישראל את־יֹרְשָׁיו אָמַר יְהוָֹה	והשמעתי עַל־רבת תרועת מלחמות והיוּ לְשממה וּלְכָלָה ובָמֹתיה באש תצתנה וירש ישראל את־ רֹאשיו (מֶמְשַׁלְתּוֹ)
3	ספדנה וְהִתְשׁוֹטַטְנָה בַּגְּדֵרוֹת כי מַלְכָּם בגולה ילך	וספדנה כי מִלְכֹּל (מִלְכֹּם) ילך בגולה[d]
4	מה־תתהללִי בָּעֲמָקִים זָב עמקֵךְ הבת השובבה הבטחה באֹצְרֹתֶיהָ מי יבוא אֵלָי	מה־תתהללוּ בְּעמקי עֲנָקִים[e] הבת השובבה הבטחה באֹצָרֹת הָאֹמְרָה מי יבוא עָלַי[f]

[a] Targ. עַל. [b] Vid. 11:23; 23:12. [c] Μελχολ. Vid. vs. 3. [d] Vid. vs. 1. [e] Ἐνακείμ.—Targ. תּוּקְפָּךְ. [f] Targ. אָמְרָה מַן יֵיעוֹל עֲלַי.

5	הנני מביא עליך פחד נאם־אֲדֹנָי יֱהֹוִה צְבָאוֹת	הנני מביא פחד עליך נאם־יְהֹוָה
	ואין מקבץ לַנֹּדֵד	ואין מקבץ
6	וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵן אָשִׁיב אֶת־שְׁבוּת בְּנֵי־עַמּוֹן נְאֻם־יְהֹוָה	Desunt
7	כה אמר יהוה צְבָאוֹת הַאֵין עוד חכמה בתימן	כה אמר יהוה אין עוד חכמה בתימן
8	נָסוּ הָפְנוּ העמקו לשבת ישבי דדן כי איד עֵשָׂו הבאתי עליו עת פקדתיו	נֻשָּׂא[a] מְקוֹמָם (הַפִּנָּה?) העמקו לשבת הַיֹּשְׁבִים בְּדדן כי איד עֵשָׂה (עָשׂוּ) הבאתי עליו בְּעת פקדתיו
9	אִם־בֹּצְרִים באו לָךְ לא ישאירו עֹלֵלוֹת אִם־גנבים בלילה הִשְׁחִיתוּ דַיָּם	כִּי־בצרים באו אֲשֶׁר לא ישאירו לָךְ שָׂרִיד כְּגנבים בלילה הַשִּׁיתוּ (= שָׁתוּ) יָדָם[b]
10	כִּי־אני חָשַׂפְתִּי אֶת־עשיו גליתי את־מסתָּרָיו ונחבה לא יוכל שֻׁדַּד זַרְעוֹ וְאֶחָיו וּשְׁכֵנָיו	כִּי־אני סָחַפְתִּי (סָחַבְתִּי) את־עשיו גליתי את־מסתְּרֵיהֶם ונחבה לא יוכלו שֻׁדְּדוּ בִּזְרֹעֵי אָחִיו שכ׳
11	עָזְבָה יתֹמֶיךָ אֲנִי אֲחַיֶּה	לַעֲזֹב יתמך לְמַעַן יִחְיֶה וְאֶהְיֶה
12	הִנֵּה	Deest
	שתו יִשְׁתּוּ ואתה הוא נקה תִּנָּקֶה לא תנקה כִּי שָׁתֹה תִשְׁתֶּה	שתו ואתה נקה לא תנקה
13	כִּי־לשמה לחרפה לְחֹרֶב ולקללה תהיה בָצְרָה וכל־עריה תהיינה לְחָרְבוֹת עולם	כִּי־לשמה ולחרפה ולקללה תהיה בְּתוֹכָהּ (בְּקִרְבָּהּ) וכל־עריה תהיינה חֳרָבוֹת לעולם[c]
14	וציר בגוים שָׁלוּחַ התקבצו ובאו עָלֶיהָ וְקוּמוּ למלחמה	וצירים בגוים שָׁלַח התקבצו ובאו אֲלֶיהָ קומו למלחמה
15	כִּי־הִנֵּה	Deest
16	זְדוֹן לבך שֹׁכְנִי בְּחגוי הַסֶּלַע תֹּפְשִׂי מרום גבעה כִּי־תַגביה כנשר קִנֶּךָ משם אורידך נְאֻם־יְהֹוָה	קְלוֹן לבך שָׁכַן חגוי הַסְּלָעִים תָּפַשׂ מָעוֹז (מִבְצָר) גבעת מָרוֹם (מרום גבעה) כי הִגְבִּיהַ כנשר קִנּוֹ משם אורידך

[a] ἡπατήθη. [b] Cf. Exod. 23:1. [c] Targ. לְצָלַם (לְעָלַם).

17	כל עבר עליה יִשֹּׁם וְישרק עַל־	כל עבר עליה ישרק
	כָּל־מַכּוֹתֶהָ	
18	כְּמַהְפֵּכַת סדם ועמרה ושכניה	כַּאֲשֶׁר נֶהֶפְכָה סדם ועמרה ושכניה
	אמר יהוה	אמר יהוה צְבָאוֹת
	ולא־יגור בָּהּ בן־אדם	ולא־יגור שָׂם[a] בן־אדם
19	מִגְּאוֹן הירדן אל־נוה איתן	מִתּוֹךְ הירדן אל־נוה איתם[b]
	ארִיצֶנּוּ מעליה וּמִי בָחוּר אֵליה	אריצֵם מעליה וּבַחוּרִים עָליה[c]
	אֶפְקֹד	פִּקְדוּ (תִּפְקְדוּ)
	ומי יְעִידֶנִּי	ומי יַעֲמֹד נֶגְדִּי (יְעִידֵנִי)
20	אשר יעץ אֶל־אדום וּמחשְׁבוֹתיו	אשר יעץ עַל[d]־אדום ומחשַׁבְתּוֹ[e]
	אשר חשב אֶל־ישבי תימן	אשר חשב עַל[f]־ישבי תימן
21	מִקּוֹל נפלם רעשה הארץ צְעָקָה	כִּי מקול נפלם רעשה הארץ וְקוֹל
	בְּיַם־סוּף נִשְׁמַע קוֹלָהּ	(וְצַעֲקַת) הַיָּם לֹא נשמע
22	הנה כַּנֶּשֶׁר יַעֲלֶה וְיִדְאֶה ויפרש	הנה כְּנשר יִרְאֶה ויפרש כנפים
	כנפיו על־בָּצְרָה	על־מִבְצָרֶיהָ (בָּצְרָה?)
23	כי־שמעה רעה שמעו נמגו בַּיָּם	כי־שמעו שמעה רעה נמגו דָּאֲגוּ
	דְּאָגָה השקט לא יוכל	השקט לא יוכלו[g]
24	וְרטט החזיקה	רטט החזיקה
	צָרָה וַחֲבָלִים אֲחָזַתָּה כַּיּוֹלֵדָה	Deest
25	איך לא־עֻזְּבָה עיר תְּהִלָּה קרית	איך לא־עָזַב עִירִי קרית מְשׂוֹשָׂם
	מְשׂוֹשִׂי	(קִרְיָה אָהֲבוּ)
26	לכן יפלו בחוּרֶיהָ ברחבתֶיהָ	לכן יפלו בחורים ברחבתַיִךְ וכל־
	וכל־אנשי הַמִּלְחָמָה יִדַּמּוּ	אנשי מִלְחַמְתֵּךְ יִפְּלוּ (יֵרָמוּ)
	בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא נאם יהוה	נאם יהוה
	צְבָאוֹת	
27	ואכלה ארמנות בן־הדד	ואכלה ארמנות[h] בן־הדר
28	וּלְמַמְלְכוֹת חצור	למלכות חָצֵר
	קומו עלו אֶל־קדר	קומו וַעֲלוּ עַל[i]־קדר
29	וקראו עליהם מָגוֹר מסביב	וקראו עליהם כָּלָה[k] (מגור?) מסביב
30	נסו נֻדוּ	נסו
	ישְׁבֵי חָצוֹר נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	ישבים בְּחָצֵר[l]

[a] Vid. vs. 33; 50:40. [b] Αἰθάμ. [c] Targ. עֲלַהּ. [d] Targ. עַל. [e] Targ. וּמַחְשַׁבְתַּהּ. [f] Targ. עַל. [g] Targ. לָא יָכְלִין לְמְנָח. [h] ἄμφοδα. [i] Targ. עַל. [k] ἀπώλειαν. [l] Vid. vs. 33.

Verse	Hebrew text	Reconstructed text
	כי־יעץ עליכם נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מלך־ בבל עצה וחשב עֲלֵיהֶם מחשבה	כי־יעץ עליכם מלך־בבל עצה וחשב מחשבת
31	קומו עלו אֶל־גוי שליו	קומו וַעלו עַל־גוי[a] שליו
	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	Deest
	לא־דלתים וְלא־בריחַ לוֹ	אֲשֶׁר לָהֶם לא־דלתים לא־בריחִים לא־בַדִּים[b]
32	לְשָׁלָל	לְכָלָה (לְשַׁמֵּם)
	וּמכל־עבריו	מכל־עבריו
33	והיתה חצור לִמעון תַּנִּים שממה עד־עולם	והיתה חָצֵר[c] מעון יְעֵנִים ושממה עד־עולם
	ולא־יגור בָּהּ בן־אדם	ולא־יגור שָׁם[d] בן־אדם
34	אֲשֶׁר הָיָה דְבַר־יְהוָֹה אֶל־יִרְמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא אל־עילם בְּרֵאשִׁית מַלְכוּת צִדְקִיָּהוּ מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה לֵאמֹר	אל־עילם
35	כה אמר יהוה צְבָאוֹת הִנְנִי שֹׁבֵר אֶת־קשת עילם	כה אמר יהוה נִשְׁבַּר קשת עילם
36	והבאתי אֶל־עילם	והבאתי עַל[e]־עילם
	וזרתים לְכל הרחות האלה ולא־ יהיה הַגוי	וזרתים בְּכל הרחות האלה ולא־ יהיה גוי[f]
37	והחתתי אֶת־עֵילָם	והחתתי אוֹתָם
	וְלִפְנֵי	Deest
	והבאתי עליהם רָעָה אֶת־חרון אפי נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה ושלחתי אחריהם אֶת־הַחֶרֶב עד כַּלּוֹתִי אותם	והבאתי עליהם כַּחרון אפי ושלחתי אחריהם חַרְבִּי עד כְּלֹתם
38	והַאֲבַדְתִּי משם מלך ושרים נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	והַעֲבַרְתִּי משם מלך ושרים
39	אשוּב את־שבוּת עילם	וְאשיב את שבות עילם

[a] Targ. עַל עַמָּא. [b] οἷς οὐκ εἰσὶ θύραι, οὐ βάλανοι, οὐ μοχλοί. [c] Vid. vs. 30. [d] Vid. vs. 18; 50:40. [e] Targ. עַל. [f] Targ. וְלָא יְהֵי עַם.

CAPUT L.

1	הַדָּבָר אשר דבר יהוה אֶל־בבל אֶל־אֶרֶץ כַּשְׂדִּים בְּיַד יִרְמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא	דְּבַר־יהוה אשר דבר עַל[a]־בבל
2	וּשְׂאוּ־נֵס הַשְׁמִיעוּ אל־תכחדו	וְאל־תכחדו
	חַת מרדך הֹבִישׁוּ עֲצַבֶּיהָ חַתּוּ גִּלּוּלֶיהָ	בְּלִי־חָת (הַבֹּטְחָה) וְהַמְּעֻנָּגָה (וְהָעֲדִינָה) סְגֻרָה מרדך
3	נָדוּ הָלָכוּ	Desunt
4	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	
	יַחְדָּו הָלוֹךְ וּבָכוֹ ילכו וְאֶת־יהוה אלהיהם יְבַקֵּשׁוּ	יַחַד הוֹלְכִים ובוֹכִים ילכו את־יהוה אלהיהם מְבַקְשִׁים
5	ציון ישאלו דרך הנה פְּנֵיהֶם בֹּאוּ ונלוו אל־יְהוָֹה ברית עולם לא תשכח	עַד־ציון[b] ישאלו הַדרך הנה כִּי פניהם יִתְּנוּ (יָשִׂימוּ) וְיָבֹאוּ[c] ונלוו אל־אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה כִּי ברית עולם לא תשכח
6	צאן אבדות הָיוּ עמי רעיהם התעום הרים שׁוֹבְבִים מהר אֶל־גבעה הלכו	צאן אבדות הָיָה עמי רעיהם התעום עַל־הרים שׁוֹבְבָם מהר עַל־גבעה הלכו
7	וְצריהם אמרו לא נֶאְשָׁם וּמִקְוֵה אבותיהם יְהוָֹה	צריהם אמרו לא נְשַׁלְּחֵם (נְשָׁאֵם) לְמִקְוֵה אבותיהם
8	ומארץ כשדים יְצָאוּ והיו כְּעַתּוּדִים לפני־צאן	ומארץ כשדִים וּצְאוּ והיו כִּנְחָשִׁים (כְּתַנִּינִים) לפני־צאן
9	כי הנה אנכי מעיר וּמַעֲלֶה על־בבל קְהַל־גוים גְּדֹלִים	כי הנה אנכי מעיר על־בבל קְהִלּוֹת־גוים
	חִצָּיו כְּגִבּוֹר משכיל	כְּחֵץ גבור[d] משכיל
10	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	Deest
11	כי תִשְׂמְחִי כִּי תעלזי	כי שְׂמַחְתֶּם וַתעלזו (וַתִּתְהַלְלוּ)
	כי תפושי כעגלה דָשָׁא ותצהלי כאברים	כי תפזו[e] כעגלה בַּדֶּשֶׁא ותתנגחו כאברים
12	חפרה יולדתכם	חפרה אֵם יולדתכם לְטוֹבָה

[a] Targ. עַל. [b] Targ. לְצִיּוֹן. [c] Targ. יִיתוּן. [d] Cf. Ps. 120:4. [e] Targ אֲרֵי תְרוּצוּן.

	הִנֵּה אחרית גוים מדבר צִיָּה וַעֲרָבָה	אחרית גוים מדבר
13	והיתה שממה כלה כל עבר עַל־בָּבל ישם וישרק על־כל־מכּוֹתֶיהָ	והיתה לְשממה[a] כלה וְכל עבר בְּבבל (בְּתוֹךְ בבל) ישם וישְׁרְקוּ עַל־כל־מַכָּתָהּ
14	ידו אֲליה אל־תחמלו אֶל־חֵץ כִּי לַיהוָֹה חָטָאָה	ידו עָליה אל־תחמלו עֲל־חִצֵּיכֶם
15	הָרִיעוּ עָלֶיהָ סָבִיב נָתְנָה ידָהּ נהרסו חומוֹתֶיהָ נקמת יְהוָֹה היא הנקמוּ בָהּ	וְתִתְפְּשׂוּהָ רָפוּ יָדֶיהָ[b] וְנהרסה חוֹמָתָהּ נקמת אלֹהים היא הנקמו עָלֶיהָ
16	כרתו זוֹרֵעַ מבבל וְתפש מגל מפני חרב היּוֹנה ואיש לארצו ינוסוּ	כרתו זֶרַע מבבל תפש מגל מפני חרב הַיְּוֹנָה[c] (הַיְּוָנִית) ואיש לארצו ינוס
17	אריות הדיחוּ עִצְּמוֹ נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מלך בבל	אריות הדיחוֹ (הדיחוהוּ) עִצְּמוּ מלך בבל
18	יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הנני פקד אֶל־מלך בבל וְאֶל־ארצו כאשר פקדתי אֶל־מלך אשור	יהוה הנני פקד עַל[d]־מלך בבל וְעַל[e]־ארצו כאשר פקדתי עַל[f]־מלך אשור
19	ורעה הַכרמל וְהַבָּשָׁן ובהר אפרים וְהַגִּלעד תִּשׂבע נפשו	ורעה בַּכרמל[g] וּבגלעד ובהר אפרים וְתשבע נפשו
20	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה יְבֻקַּשׁ את־עון ישראל כי אסלח לַאֲשֶׁר אַשְׁאִיר	יְבַקְּשׁוּ[h] את־עון ישראל כי אסלח לִנְשְׁאָרִים
21	על־הארץ מְרָתַיִם עלה עליה וְאֶל־יוֹשְׁבֵי פְּקוֹד חֲרֹב והחרם אַחֲרֵיהֶם	על־הארץ יְהוָֹה מְרִירוּת עלה עליה וְעַל[i]־הַיּוֹשְׁבִים עָלֶיהָ פקוד חֶרֶב והחרם
22	קול מלחמה בָּאָרֶץ ושבר גדול	קול מלחמה ושבר גדול בְּאֶרֶץ כַּשְׂדִּים
24	יָקֹשְׁתִּי לָךְ וגם־נלכדת בבל וְאַתְּ לא ידעת	בָּאוּ (עָלוּ) עָלַיִךְ וְלא ידעת כְּבבל וגם־נלכדת
25	כי־מלאכה הִיא לאדני יהוה צְבָאוֹת	כי־מלאכה לאדני יהוה
26	בֹּאוּ־לָהּ מִקֵּץ	כִּי בָאוּ קִצֶּיהָ (עִתּוֹתֶיהָ)

---

[a] Targ. לְצָדוּ. [b] Cf. vs. 43; 6:24. [c] Vid. 46:16. [d] Targ. עַל. [e] Targ. וְעַל. [f] Targ. עַל. [g] Targ. בְּאַרְעָא כַּרְמְלָא. [h] Targ. יִתְבְּעוּן. [i] Targ. וְעַל.

	סָלּוּה כמו־עֲרֵמִים	תָּרוּה (חִקְרוּה) כמו־מְעָרָה (מְעָרִים?)
27	חרבו כל־פָּרֶיהָ ירדו לטבח הוי עֲליהם	חרבו כל־פִּרְיָהּ וְירדו לטבח הוי אֲליהם[a]
	עת פקדתם	וְעת פקדתם
28	נִקְמַת הֵיכָלוֹ	Deest
29	השמיעו אֶל־בבל רבים כל־דֹּרְכֵי קשת	השמיעו עַל[b]־בבל רבים כל־דֹּרֵךְ קשת
	אַל־יְהִי־[c]פְּלֵיטָה שלמו־לה כפעלָהּ	אל־יהי פליטָהּ (אל־יהי־לָהּ פָּלִיט) שלמו־לה כפעלֶיהָ
	אֶל־קדוש ישראל	אֵל קדוש ישראל
30	יִדַּמּוּ בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא נאם־יהוה	יֵרָמוּ נאם־יהוה
31	הנני אֵלֶיךָ זדון נאם־אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה צְבָאוֹת	הנני עָלֶיךָ[c] הַזדון נאם־יְהוָֹה
	עת פקדתיך	וְעת פקדתך
32	וכשל זָדוֹן ונפל ואין לו מקים והצתי אש בעָרָיו	וכשל זְדוֹנֵךְ (הַזָּדוֹן) ונפל ואין מקים לו והצתי אש ביַעְרוֹ[d]
33	יהוה צְבָאוֹת	יהוה
	יחדו וְכל־שביהם	יחדו כל־שביהם
	מאנו שלחם	כִּי מאנו שלחם
34	גֹּאֲלָם	וְגֹאֲלָם (גַּם־גֹּאֲלָם)
	ריב יריב את־ריבם	ריב יריב לְיריביו (לִמְרִיבָיו)
35	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה	Deest
	וְאֶל־ישבי בבל וְאֶל־שריה וְאֶל־חכמיה	וְעַל[e]־ישבי בבל וְעַל[e]־שריה וְעַל[f]־חכמיה
36	חֶרֶב אֶל־הַבַּדִּים וְנֹאָלוּ	Deest
	חרב אֶל־גבוריה וחתו:	חרב עַל[f]־גבוריה וחתו חרב עַל־
37	חרב אֶל־סוּסָיו וְאֶל־רכבּוֹ וְאֶל־כָּל־הערב אשר בתוכה והיו לְנשים חרב אֶל־אוֹצְרֹתֶיהָ וּבֻזָּזוּ	סוּסֵיהֶם וְעַל־רכבֵיהֶם[h]: חֶרֶב[g] עַל־גִּבּוֹרֵיהֶם וְעַל[i]־הערב אשר בתוכה והיו כְנשיב[k] חרב עַל[l]־הָאוֹצָרוֹת וּפֻזָּרוּ (וּבֻזָּרוּ)

[a] Cf. 48:1. [b] Targ. עַל. [c] Targ. עֲלָךְ. [d] Cf. 21:14. [e] Targ. וְעַל. [f] Targ. עַל. [g] Inc. vs. 37. [h] Targ. עַל סוּסְוָתְהוֹן וְעַל רְתִיכֵיהוֹן. [i] Targ. וְעַל. [k] Vid. 51:30.—Targ. כִּנְשַׁיָּא. [l] Targ. עַל.

38	חֹרֶב אֶל־מימיה וְיָבֵשׁוּ	עַל־מימיה וַיֵּבֹשׁוּ
	ובאֵימִים יתהֹללו	ובאִיִּים [אֲשֶׁר] יתהַלֵּלוּ
39	לכן ישבו צִיִּים אֶת־איים וישבו	לכן ישבו צִיִּים (צִירִים) בָּאיים
	בה בנות יַעֲנָה וְלֹא־תשב עוד	וישבו בה בנות יַנְשׁוּף[b](?) לא־
	לנצח וְלֹא תִשְׁכֹּן עַד־דּוֹר וָדֹר	תשב עוד לנצח
40	כְּמַהְפֵּכַת אלהים	כַּהֲפוֹךְ[c] אלהים
	ולא־יגור בָּהּ בן־אדם	ולא־יגור שָׁם[d] בן־אדם
42	קשת וכידן יַחֲזִיקוּ אכזרי הֵמָּה	קשת וכידן לָהֶם אכזרי הוּא ולא
	ולא ירַחֵמוּ	יְרַחֵם
	וְעַל־סוסים ירכבו ערוך כְּאִישׁ	עַל־סוסים ירכבו ערוך כָּאֵשׁ[e]
	למלחמה עָלַיִךְ בת־בבל	למלחמה אֵלַיִךְ בת־בבל
44	יעלה מִגְּאוֹן הַירדן אל־נְוֵה איתן	יעלה מִירדן אל־גֶּיא איתן[f]
	ומי בחור אֵליה אפקד	וְכָל־בחור עָלֶיהָ[g] אפקד
	ומי יוֹעִדֶנִּי	ומי יַעֲמֹד נֶגְדִּי (יְעִידֵנִּי)
45	אשר יעץ אֶל־בבל	אשר יעץ עַל[h]־בבל
	אֶל־אֶרֶץ כשדים	עַל־יוֹשְׁבֵי[i] כשדים
	אם־לא יסחבום צְעִירֵי הַצֹּאן	אם־לא יסחבו (יַשְׁחִיתוּ) צְפִירֵי צֹאנָם
	אם־לא ישים עליהם נוה	אם־לא ישים נוה מֵעליהם
46	מקול נִתְפְּשָׂה בבל נִרְעֲשָׁה	כִּי מקול תְּפִישַׂת בבל תִּרְעַשׁ הארץ
	הארץ וזעקה בגוים נִשְׁמָע	וזעקה בגוים תִּשָּׁמַע

CAPUT LI.

1	וְאֶל־ישבי לֵב קָמָי רוח משחית	וְעַל־ישבי כַּשְׂדִּים[k] רוח בֹּעֵר משחית[l]
2	זָרִים וְזֵרוּהָ	זֵדִים וְזָדוּהָ[m]
	כִּי־הָיוּ עָלֶיהָ מסביב ביום רעה	הוֹי עַל־בָּבֶל מסביב ביום רָעָתָהּ
3	אֶל־ידרך ידרך הדרך קשתו וְאֶל־	ידרך הדרך קשתו (יַעֲטֶה) יִתְעַלֵּף
	יתעַל בסרינו ואל־תחמלו אֶל־	בסריגו ואל־תחמלו עַל[n]־בחריה
	בחריה החרימו כל־צבאה	וְהחרימו כל־צבאה

[a] Targ. מְשְׁתַּבְּחִין. [b] σειρήνων. [c] Targ. כְּמָא דְרַחֵק. [d] Vid. 49:18, 33. [e] Vid. 6:23. [f] Γαιβάν. [g] Targ. אֲמַנֵּי עֲלַהּ. [h] Targ. עַל. [i] Targ. עַל יָתְבֵי. [k] Targ. וְעַל יָתְבֵי אַרְעָא כַּסְדָּאֵי. [l] Cf. Isa. 4:4. [m] Targ. בָּזוֹזִין וְיִבְזוֹנַהּ. [n] Targ. עַל.

5	מאלֹהָיו	מאלֹהֵיהֶם[a]
	מקדוש ישראל	מקדושֵׁי ישראל
4	ומדקרים בְּחוּצוֹתֶיהָ	ומדקרים מִחוּץ לָהּ[b]
6	אל־תִּדַּמּוּ	וְאל־תֵּרָמוּ
	עת נְקָמָה הִיא ליהוה גמול הוא	עת נִקְמָתָהּ ליהוה גמול הוא
	מְשַׁלֵּם לה	יִגְמְלוּ לה
7	על־כן יתהֹלְלוּ גוֹיִם	על־כן יתנוֹדְדוּ (יתהַלְלוּ)
8	פתאם	ופתאם
	לַמְכֹאוֹבָהּ	לשִׁבְרָהּ[c] (לְמַכָּתָה)
9	עִזבוּהָ	נַעַזְבֶנָּה
	כי נָגַע	כי קָרַב[d]
	וְנשא עד־שְׁחָקִים	נשא עד־כּוֹכָבִים
10	את־צִדְקֹתֵינוּ	את־מִשְׁפָּטוֹ
	את־מעֲשֵׂה יהוה	את־מעֲשֵׂי יהוה
11	הָבֵרוּ החצים מלאו הַשְּׁלָטִים	הכִינוּ החצים מלאו הָאַשְׁפּוֹת
	מַלְכֵי מדי כי־עַל־בבל מְזִמָּתוֹ	מֶלֶךְ מדי כי־אֶל־בבל זָעֲמוּ (חֲמָתוֹ)
	כי־נקמת הֵיכָלוֹ	כי־נקמת עַמּוֹ הִיא
12	אֶל־חומת בבל	עַל[e]־חומת בבל
	הַחֲזִיקוּ הַמִּשְׁמָר הקימו שמרים	הקימו הָאַשְׁפּוֹת הָקִיצוּ (הָעִירוּ)
	הכינו הָאֹרְבִים כי גַּם־זמם	שמרים הכינו הַחֲרָבִים(וֹת) כי
	יהוה גם־עשה	זמם גם־עשה יהוה
	אֶל־ישבי בבל	עַל[e]־ישבי בבל
13	שֹׁכַנְתְּי	שֹׁכְנִים (שֹׁכְנֵי)
	רַבַּת אוצָרֹת	וְעַל־רֹב אוצְרֹתֶיהָ[f]
	אַמַּת בִּצְעֵךְ	אֱמֶת אֶל־מֵעָיִךְ
14	נשבע יהוה צְבָאוֹת בְּנַפְשׁוֹ	כִּי נשבע יהוה בִּזְרוֹעוֹ[g]
	אָדָם	אֲנָשִׁים
	וענו עליך הֵידָד	וענו עליך הַיֹּרֵד (הַיֹּרְדִים)
15	עשה ארץ	יְהוָה עשה ארץ[h]
	ובתבונתו	בתבונתו
16	לקול תִּתּוֹ	לקול נָתַן
	מקצה־ארץ	מקצה הָארץ

[a] Targ. מֵאֱלָהָהוֹן. [b] ἔξωθεν αὐτῆς. [c] Targ. לִתְבִירַהּ. [d] Targ. אֲרֵי קְרִיב. [e] Targ. עַל. [f] Targ. בֵּית גִּנְזָהָא. [g] Cf. Isa. 62:8. [h] Vid. 10:12.

	ויוצא רוּחַ	ויוצא אור[a]
17	מִפֻּסֶל כי שקר נִסְכּוֹ וְלֹא־רוח בם	מִפְּסִילָיו כי שקר נָסְכוּ[b] לא־רוח בם
18	הֶבֶל המה מַעֲשֵׂה תעתעים	הֲבָלִים המה מַעֲשֵׂי תעתעים
19	וְשֵׁבֶט נחלתו יהוה צְבָאוֹת שמו	נחלתו יהוה שמו
20	מַפֵּץ־אתה לי. ונִפצתי בך גוים והשחתי בְּךָ מַמלכות	מֵפִיץ[c]־אתה לי והֲפצתי[d] בך גוים והשחתי מִמְּךָ[e] (בך) מלכים
21	ונִפצתי בך סוס ורכבו ונִפצתי רֶכֶב ורכבוֹ	והֲפצתי[d] בך סוס ורכבו: והֲפצתי[f d] בְּךָ מַרְכָּבוֹת ורכביהֶם[g]
22	ונִפצתי בך איש ואשה ונִפצתי בְּךָ זָקֵן וָנָעַר ונפצתי בך בחור ובתולה	והֲפצתי[d] בך בחור ובתולה והֲפצתי[d] בך איש ואשה
23	ונִפצתי בך רעה ועדרו ונִפצתי בך אכר וצמדו ונִפצתי בך פחות וסגנים	והֲפצתי[d] בך רעה ועדרו והֲפצתי[d] בך אכר וצמדו והֲפצתי[d] בך פחות וסגניך
24	את כל־רָעָתָם אשר עשו בְּציון	את כל־רעוֹתֵיהֶם אשר עשו עַל־ציון
25	נְאֻם־יְהוָֹה וגלגלתיך מִן־הסלעים ונתתיך לְהר שרפה	Deest וגלגלתיך עַל־הסלעים ונתתיך כְּהר שרפה
26	ואבן למוסדות כי־שִׁמְמוֹת עולם תהיה	ואבן למוסד כי־לִשְׁמָמָה תהיה לְעולם
27	שאו־נס בָּארץ תקעו שופר בגוים מַמְלְכוֹת אֲרָרַט מני ואַשְׁכְּנַז פקדו עליה טִפְסָר העלו־סוס כילק סָמָר	שאו־נס עַל־הָארץ תקעו בגוים שופר מְלָכִים הֲרִמּוּ מני ואכנזים[h] פקדו עליה כָּרִים[i] העלו עָלֶיהָ סוס כילק כַּבִּיר
28	קַדְּשׁוּ עליה גוים את־מַלְכֵי מדי את־פחוֹתֶיהָ ואת־כל־סגָנֶיהָ ואת כל־אֶרֶץ מֶמְשַׁלְתּוֹ	הֶעֱלוּ עליה גוים את־מֶלֶךְ מדי ואת־כל־הָאָרֶץ את־פחוֹתָיו ואת־ כל־סגָנָיו
29	וַתִּרְעַשׁ הארץ מַחְשְׁבוֹת יהוה	רָעֲשָׁה הארץ מַחֲשֶׁבֶת יהוה

[a] Vid. 10:13. [b] Targ. אַתִּיכוּנוּן. [c] Targ. מְבַדֵּר. [d] Targ. וַאֲבַדֵּר.
[e] ἐκ σοῦ vel ἐν σοί. [f] Inc. vs. 22. [g] Targ. רְתִיכִין וְרִכְבֵּיהוֹן. [h] Ἀχαναζέοις.
[i] βελοστάσεις.

	מֵאֵין יוֹשֵׁב	וְלֹא תוּשָׁב (וְאֵין יוֹשֵׁב בָּהּ)
30	חָדְלוּ גִבּוֹרֵי בָבֶל	חָדַל גִּבּוֹר בָּבֶל
	יָשְׁבוּ בַּמְּצָדוֹת	יָשְׁבוּ שָׁם בַּמְּצָדָה
	הָיוּ לְנָשִׁים הִצִּיתוּ מִשְׁכְּנֹתֶיהָ	הָיוּ כְנָשִׁים[a] נִצְּתוּ (הוּצְּתוּ) מִשְׁכְּנֹתֶיהָ
31	כִּי־נִלְכְּדָה עִירוֹ מִקָּצֶה׃	כִּי־נִלְכְּדָה עִירוֹ׃
32	וְהַמַּעְבָּרוֹת נִתְפָּשׂוּ וְאֶת־הָאֲגַמִּים שָׂרְפוּ בָאֵשׁ וְאַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה נִבְהָלוּ	מִקָּצֶה[b] מַעְבְּרוֹתָיו נִתְפָּשׂוּ וְאֶת־אַגְמֵּיהֶם שָׂרְפוּ בָאֵשׁ וַאֲנָשָׁיו הַלֹּחֲמִים (וְאַנְשֵׁי מִלְחַמְתּוֹ) יָצָאוּ (הָלָכוּ)
33	כִּי כֹה אָמַר יהוה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּת־בָּבֶל כְּגֹרֶן עֵת הִדְרִיכָהּ עוֹד מְעַט וּבָאָה עֵת־הַקָּצִיר לָהּ	כִּי כֹה אָמַר יהוה בָּתֵּי מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל כְּגֹרֶן עֵת יוּדָשׁוּ עוֹד מְעַט וּבָא קְצִירָהּ
34	אֲכָלַנוּ הֲמָמַנוּ נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל הִצִּיגָנוּ כְּלִי רִיק בְּלָעָנוּ כַּתַּנִּין מִלָּא כְרֵשׂוֹ מֵעֲדָנָי הֱדִיחָנוּ׃	אֲכָלַנִי חִלְּקַנִי (הֱדִיקַנִי) הִשִּׂיגַנִי אֹפֶל (כָּלָא) דַּק נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל בְּלָעַנִי כְתַנִּין מִלָּא כְרֵשׂוֹ מֵעֲדָנַי[c]׃
35	חֲמָסִי וּשְׁאֵרִי עַל־בָּבֶל	הֱדִיחוּנִי[d] חֲמָסִי וְשִׁבְרִי[e] (שֹׁדִי) אֶל־בָּבֶל
	וְדָמִי אֶל־יֹשְׁבֵי כַשְׂדִּים	וְדָמִי עַל[f]־יֹשְׁבֵי כַשְׂדִּים
36	הִנְנִי־רָב אֶת־רִיבֵךְ	הִנְנִי־רָב אֶת־יְרִיבֵךְ
37	וְהָיְתָה בָבֶל לְגַלִּים מְעוֹן־תַּנִּים שַׁמָּה וּשְׁרֵקָה מֵאֵין יוֹשֵׁב	וְהָיְתָה בָבֶל לְשַׁמָּה וְלֹא תוּשָׁב
38	יַחְדָּו כַּכְּפִרִים יִשְׁאָגוּ נָעֲרוּ כְּגוֹרֵי אֲרָיוֹת	כִּי יַחְדָּו כַּכְּפִירִים נֵעֹרוּ וּכְגוֹרֵי אֲרָיוֹת
39	אָשִׁית אֶת־מִשְׁתֵּיהֶם	אֶתֵּן מִשְׁתֶּה לָהֶם
	לְמַעַן יַעֲלֹזוּ	לְמַעַן יֵרָדְמוּ (יֵעָרְלוּ, יִרְעָלוּ)
40	אוֹרִידֵם	וְהוֹרִידֵם
	כְּאֵילִים	וּכְאֵילִים
41	שֵׁשַׁךְ	Deest
	אֵיךְ הָיְתָה לְשַׁמָּה בָּבֶל בַּגּוֹיִם	אֵיךְ הָיְתָה בָבֶל לְשַׁמָּה בַּגּוֹיִם
42	נִכְסָתָה	וְנִכְסָתָה

[a] Vid. 50:37.—Targ. כִּנְשַׁיָא. [b] Inc. vs. 32. [c] Targ. בְּטוּב אַרְעִי. [d] Inc. vs. 35. [e] Targ. וּבִזִּי. [f] Targ. עַל.

43	היו עריה לְשַׁמָּה ארץ ציה	היו עריה כְּארץ ציה וערבה לא־
	וערבה אֶרֶץ לא־ישב בהֵן כָּל־	ישב בה[a] גַּם־אֶחָד ולא־יָלִין
	אִישׁ ולא־יַעֲבֹר בהֵן בן־אדם	בה[b] בן־אדם
44	ופקדתי על־בֵּל בְּבבל	ופקדתי על־בבל
	ולא־ינהרו אליו עוד גוים גַּם־	ולא ינהרו אליו עוד הַגוים
	חוֹמַת בָּבֶל נָפָלָה	
45	צְאוּ מִתּוֹכָהּ עַמִּי וּמַלְּטוּ אִישׁ	
	אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ מֵחֲרוֹן אַף־יְהוָה׃	
46	וּפֶן־יֵרַךְ לְבַבְכֶם וְתִירְאוּ בַּשְּׁמוּעָה	
	הַנִּשְׁמַעַת בָּאָרֶץ וּבָא בַשָּׁנָה	
	הַשְּׁמוּעָה וְאַחֲרָיו בַּשָּׁנָה	
	הַשְּׁמוּעָה וְחָמָס בָּאָרֶץ מֹשֵׁל	Desunt
47	עַל־מֹשֵׁל׃ לָכֵן הִנֵּה יָמִים בָּאִים	
	וּפָקַדְתִּי עַל־פְּסִילֵי בָבֶל וְכָל־	
	אַרְצָהּ תֵּבוֹשׁ וְכָל־חֲלָלֶיהָ יִפְּלוּ	
48	בְתוֹכָהּ׃ וְרִנְּנוּ עַל־בָּבֶל שָׁמַיִם	
	וָאָרֶץ וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר בָּהֶם כִּי מִצָּפוֹן	
	יָבוֹא־לָהּ הַשּׁוֹדְדִים נְאֻם יְהוָה׃	
49	גַּם־בָּבֶל לִנְפֹּל חַלְלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל גַּם־	גם־בְּבבל יִפְּלוּ[c] חללי כל־
	לְבבל נָפְלוּ חללי כל־הארץ	הארץ
50	פלטים מֵחֶרֶב הלכו אל־תעמדו	פלטים מחֹרב (מֵאֶרֶץ) הלכו וְאַל־
	זכרו מרחוק את־יהוה	תעמדו אֲשֶׁר מרחוק (הָרְחוֹקִים)
		זכרו את־יהוה
51	כי־שמענו חרפה	כי־שמענו חרפָתֵנוּ
	כִּי באו זרים עַל־מקְדְּשֵׁי בית יהוה	באו זרים אֶל־מקְדָּשֵׁינוּ אֶל־בית יהוה
52	יֶאֱנֹק חָלָל	יִפְּלוּ חֲלָלִים[d]
53	כי־תעלה בבל הַשמים וכי	כי אִם־תעלה בבל כַּשמים וכי
	תבצר מְרוֹם עזה מאתי יבאו	אִם־תבצר הַחֹמוֹת[e] בְּעזה מאתי
	שדדים לָהּ	יבאו שדדים אֹתָהּ
54	קול זעקה מִבבל ושבר גדול	קול זעקה בְּבבל ושבר גדול בְּארץ
	מֵארץ כשדים	כשדים
55	וְהמו גַלֵּיהֶם כמים רבים נִתַּן	המו כמים רבים נָתַן לִשְׁאִיָּה
	שְׁאוֹן קולם	(שְׁאָה) קולהּ

[a] Targ. בַּהּ. [b] Targ. בַּהּ. [c] Targ. יִתְרְמוֹן. [d] Targ. יִתְרְמוֹן קְטִילַיָּא. [e] Targ. כְּרַכִּין.

56	כי בא עָלֶיהָ על־בבל שׁוֹדֵד וְנלכדו גבוריה חתתה קשׁתוֹתָם כי אל גְּמֻלוֹת יהוה שַׁלֵּם ישלם׃	כי בא על־בבל שוד נלכדו גבוריה חתתה קשׁתָּם כי אל ישלם לָהֶם[a]׃
57	והִשְׁכַּרְתִּי שריה וחכמיה פַּחוֹתֶיהָ וסגניה וְגִבּוֹרֶיהָ וְיָשְׁנוּ שְׁנַת־עוֹלָם וְלֹא יָקִיצוּ	יהוה[b] יְשַׁלֵּם וּשַׁכֵּר יַשְׁכִּיר שריה וחכמיה וסגניה
58	כה־אמר יהוה צְבָאוֹת חמות בבל הָרְחָבָה ושעריה הגבהים בָּאֵשׁ יצתו ויגעו עמים בְּדֵי־ריק ולאמים בְּדֵי־אֵשׁ וְיעפו	כה־אמר יהוה חֹמַת בבל הָרְחָבָה ושעריה הגבהים יצתו ולא יגעו עמים לָרִיק ולאמים בָּרֹאשׁ יעפו (יִכְלוּ)
59	הדבר אשר־צוה ירמיה הנביא אֶת־שריה ושריה שר־מְנוּחָה	הדבר אשר־צוה יְהוָֹה את־ירמיהו הנביא לֵאמֹר אֶל־שריה ושריה שר־מִנְחָה[c]
60	אשר־תבוא אֶל־בבל אֶל־ספר אֶחָד הכתבים אֶל־בבל	אשר־תבוא עַל[d]־בבל בְּספר הכתבים עַל[d]־בבל
62	יהוה אתה דברת אֶל־המקום הזה להכריתו לבלתי היות־בו יוֹשֵׁב לְמֵאדם וְעד־בהמה כי־שִׁמְמוֹת עולם תהיה	יהוה יֱהוִֹה (אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה) אתה דברת עַל[d]־המקום הזה להכריתו ולבלתי היות־בו יוֹשְׁבִים מאדם עד־בהמה כי־שְׁמָמָה לְעולם תהיה
63	תקשר	וְתקשר
	וְיָעֵפוּ עַד־הֵנָּה דִּבְרֵי יִרְמְיָהוּ׃	Deest

CAPUT LII.

1	בֶּן־עשרים ואחת שנה	הָיָה עשרים ואחת שנה
2	וַיַּעַשׂ הָרַע בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָֹה כְּכֹל	Desunt
3	אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה יְהוֹיָקִים׃ כִּי עַל־אַף	Desunt

[a] Targ. לְהוֹן. [b] Inc. vs. 57. [c] Targ. תּוּקְרָבְתָּא. [d] Targ. עַל.

	יְהוָֹה הָיְתָה בִּירוּשָׁלַםִ וִיהוּדָה עַד־הִשְׁלִיכוֹ אוֹתָם מֵעַל־פָּנָיו וַיִּמְרֹד צִדְקִיָּהוּ בְּמֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל׃	Desunt
4	בחדש הָעֲשִׂירִי	בחדש הַתְּשִׁעִי
	הוּא וכל־חילו	וכל־חילו
	ויבנו עליה דיק סביב	ויבנו עליה דיק (?)[a] כביב
6	בַּחֹדֶשׁ הָרְבִיעִי בתשעה לחדש	בתשעה לחדש
7	יִבְרְחוּ וַיֵּצְאוּ מֵהָעִיר לילה	יָצְאוּ לילה
	בין־החֹמֹתַיִם	בין־החוֹמָה וְהַחֵל
	וילכו דרך הָערבה	וילכו דרך (אֶל־) ערבה[b]
8	וירדפו חיל־כשדים	וירדף חיל־כשדים
	וישיגו אֶת־צִדְקִיָּהוּ בְּעַרְבֹת ירחו וכל־חֵילוֹ נפצו מעליו	וישיגו אותו בְּעֵבֶר (בְּעַבְרוֹת) ירחו וכל־עֲבָדָיו נפצו מעליו
9	רִבלתה בְּאֶרֶץ חֲמָת וידבר אִתּוֹ משפטים	דִּבְלָתָה וידבר אֵלָיו בְּמשפט
10	וְגַם את־כל־שרי יהודה שחט בְּרִבלתה	וְאת־כל־שרי יהודה שחט בְּדִבלתה
11	ויתנהו בבית־הַפְּקֻדֹּת	ויתנהו בבית־רֵחַיִם
12	הִיא שְׁנַת תְּשַׁע־עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה לַמֶּלֶךְ נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל	Desunt
	עָמַד לפני מלך־בבל	עֹמֵד לפני מלך־בבל
13	ואת־כל־בתי יְרוּשָׁלַםִ	ואת־כל־בתי הָעִיר
14	ואת־כל־חמות יְרושלם סביב נִתְּצוּ כָּל־חיל כשדים	ואת־כל־חומַת ירושלם סביב נִתַּץ חיל כשדים
15	וּמִדַּלּוֹת הָעָם וְאֶת־יֶתֶר הָעָם הַנִּשְׁאָרִים בָּעִיר וְאֶת־הַנֹּפְלִים אֲשֶׁר נָפְלוּ אֶל־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל וְאֵת יֶתֶר הָאָמוֹן הֶגְלָה נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן רַב־טַבָּחִים׃	Desunt
16	וּמִדַּלּוֹת הָאָרֶץ השאיר נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן רב־טבחים	וְאֶת־יֶתֶר הָעָם השאיר רב־טבחים
17	אשר לְבית־יהוה	אשר בְּבית[c]־יהוה

[a] τετραπέδοις λίθοις. [b] εἰς Ἄραβα. [c] Targ. בְּבֵית.

	וישאו את־כָּל־נחשתם בבלה	וַיִּקְחוּ את־נחשתם וישאו (וַיָּבִיאוּ) בבלה
18	ואת־הַסִּרוֹת ואת־הַיָּעִים וְאֶת־הַמְזַמְּרוֹת ואת־המזרקות וְאֶת־הַכַּפּוֹת	ואת־הַכֶּתֶר ואת־הַגְּבִיעִים ואת־הַמִּזְלָגוֹת[a]
	לָקָחוּ	Deest
19	ואת־הַסִּפִּים ואת־המחתות ואת־הַמִּזְרָקוֹת ואת־הסירות ואת־המנרות ואת־הַכַּפּוֹת ואת־המנקיות	ואת־הַסַּפּוֹת ואת־מְזַמְּרוֹת ואת־הסירות[b] ואת־המנרות ואת־המחתות (הכפות) ואת־המנקיות
20	העמודים שנים הים הָאחד אֲשֶׁר־תחת הַמְּכֹנוֹת	וְהעמודים שנים וְהים אחד תחת הַיָּם
	כָּל־הַכֵּלִים הָאֵלֶּה	Deest
21	שְׁמֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה	שְׁלֹשִׁים וְחָמֵשׁ
	נָבוּב	סָבִיב
22	וכתרת עָלָיו נחשת וְקוֹמַת הכתרת האחת חמש אמות	וכתרת עֲלֵיהֶם נחשת וחמש אמות קוֹמָה גֹּבַהּ הכתרת האחת
	לעמוד השני וְרמונים	לעמוד השני שְׁמוֹנָה רמונים בָּאַמָּה לִשְׁתֵּים־עָשָׂר הָאַמָּה
23	רוּחָה כל־הרמונים	רוּחַ (חֵלֶק) אֶחָת וַיִּהְיוּ כל־הרמונים
24	את־שְׂרָיָה כהן הראש ואת־צְפַנְיָה כהן המשנה ואת־שלשת שמרי הַסַּף	את־כהן הראש ואת־כהן המשנה ואת־שלשת שמרי הַדֶּרֶךְ׃
25	וּמִן־הָעִיר לָקַח סריס	וְסריס
	ושבעה אֲנָשִׁים מֵרֹאֵי פני־המלך	ושבעה אַנְשֵׁי שֵׁם אֲשֶׁר בִּפְנֵי המלך
	ספר שַׂר הַצָּבָא הַמַּצְבִּא את־עם הארץ	ספר הַצְּבָאוֹת הַסֹּפֵר לְעם הארץ
26	רב־טבחים	רב־טבחֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ׃
	רִבלתה	דִּבלתה
27	וַיְמִתֵם בְּרִבלה	בְּדִבלת
	וַיִּגֶל יְהוּדָה מֵעַל אַדְמָתוֹ	Deest

---

[a] *τὰς κρεάγρας.* [b] *καὶ τὰς ἀπφὼθ καὶ τὰς μασμαρὼθ καὶ τοὺς ὑποχυτῆρας καὶ τὰς λυχνίας καὶ τὰς θυίσκας καὶ τοὺς κυάθους.*

28	זֶה הָעָם אֲשֶׁר הֶגְלָה נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר בִּשְׁנַת־שֶׁבַע יְהוּדִים שְׁלֹשֶׁת	Desunt
29	אֲלָפִים וְעֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁלֹשָׁה׃ בִּשְׁנַת שְׁמוֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה לִנְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר* מִירוּשָׁלַםִ נֶפֶשׁ שְׁמֹנֶה מֵאוֹת	
30	שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁנָיִם׃ בִּשְׁנַת שָׁלֹשׁ וְעֶשְׂרִים לִנְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר הֶגְלָה נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן רַב־טַבָּחִים יְהוּדִים נֶפֶשׁ שְׁבַע מֵאוֹת אַרְבָּעִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ אַרְבַּעַת אֲלָפִים וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת׃	
31	לגלות יהויכִן בעשרים וַחֲמִשָּׁה לחדש אויל מרדך את־ראש יהויכִין מלך־יהודה ויצא אתו מִבֵּית הַכְּלִיא	לגלות יהויקִים בעשרים וְאַרְבָּעָה לחדש אויל מדכר[a] את־ראש יהויקִים מלך־יהודה וַיְגַלְּחֵהוּ[b] ויצא אתו מן־הַבַּיִת אֲשֶׁר הָיָה כָּלוּא בוֹ (שָׁמוּר בּוֹ)
32	ממעל לְכִסֵּא ֯מלכים	ממעל הַמלכים
33	ושנה את בִּגְדֵי כלאו ואכל לחם לפניו תמיד	ושנה את בֶּגֶד כלאו ואכל לחם תמיד לפניו
34	וארחתו אֲרֻחַת תמיד נתנה־לו דְּבַר־יום ביומו כל יְמֵי חַיָּיו	וארחה לו נתנה תמיד מִדֵּי יום ביום Deest

[a] Οὐλαιμαδάχαρ. [b] Cf. Gen. 41:14.

PROFESSOR GODET'S WORKS.

(Copyright, by arrangement with the Author.)

Just published, in Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 21s.,

COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

BY F. GODET, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, NEUCHATEL.

'A perfect masterpiece of theological toil and thought. . . . Scholarly, evangelical, exhaustive, and able.'—*Evangelical Review.*

'To say a word in praise of any of Professor Godet's productions is almost like "gilding refined gold." All who are familiar with his commentaries know how full they are of rich suggestion. . . . This volume fully sustains the high reputation Godet has made for himself as a Biblical scholar, and devout expositor of the will of God. Every page is radiant with light, and gives forth heat as well.'—*Methodist New Connexion Magazine.*

In Three Volumes, 8vo, price 31s. 6d.,

A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

A New Edition, Revised throughout by the Author.

'This work forms one of the battle-fields of modern inquiry, and is itself so rich in spiritual truth, that it is impossible to examine it too closely; and we welcome this treatise from the pen of Dr. Godet. We have no more competent exegete; and this new volume shows all the learning and vivacity for which the author is distinguished.'—*Freeman.*

In Two Volumes, 8vo, price 21s.,

A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.

'Marked by clearness and good sense, it will be found to possess value and interest as one of the most recent and copious works specially designed to illustrate this Gospel.'—*Guardian.*

In Two Volumes, 8vo, price 21s.,

A COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

'We prefer this commentary to any other we have seen on the subject. . . . We have great pleasure in recommending it as not only rendering invaluable aid in the critical study of the text, but affording practical and deeply suggestive assistance in the exposition of the doctrine.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

In crown 8vo, Second Edition, price 6s.,

DEFENCE OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

TRANSLATED BY THE HON. AND REV. CANON LYTTELTON, M.A.,

RECTOR OF HAGLEY.

'There is trenchant argument and resistless logic in these lectures; but withal, there is cultured imagination and felicitous eloquence, which carry home the appeals to the heart as well as the head.'—*Sword and Trowel.*

CLARK'S FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

MESSRS. CLARK allow a SELECTION of EIGHT VOLUMES *(or more at the same ratio)* from the Volumes issued in this Series previous to 1884 *(see below)*,

At the Subscription Price of Two Guineas

(Duplicates cannot be supplied in such selections).

NON-SUBSCRIPTION PRICES WITHIN BRACKETS.

Alexander (J. A., D.D.)—Commentary on Isaiah. Two Vols. (17s.)

Baumgarten (M., Ph.D.)—The Acts of the Apostles; or, The History of the Church in the Apostolic Age. Three Vols. (27s.)

Bleek (Professor)—Introduction to the New Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)

Christlieb (Theo., D.D.)—Modern Doubt and Christian Belief. One Vol. (10s. 6d.

Delitzsch (Franz, D.D.)—Commentary on Job. Two Vols. (21s.)

—— **Commentary on the Psalms.** Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)

—— **Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon.** Two Vols. (21s.)

—— **Commentary on Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes.** One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

—— **Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah.** Two Vols. (21s.)

—— **Commentary on Epistle to the Hebrews.** Two Vols. (21s.)

—— **A System of Biblical Psychology.** One Vol. (12s.)

Döllinger (J. J. Ign. von, D.D.)—Hippolytus and Callistus; or, The Church of Rome in the First Half of the Third Century. One Vol. (7s. 6d.)

Dorner (I. A., D.D.)—A System of Christian Doctrine. Four Vols. (42s.)

—— **History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ.** Five Vols. (52s. 6d.)

Ebrard (J. H. A., D.D.)—Commentary on the Epistles of St. John. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

—— **The Gospel History: A Compendium of Critical Investigations in support of the Historical Character of the Four Gospels.** One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Gebhardt (H.)—Doctrine of the Apocalypse. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Gerlach (Otto von)—Commentary on the Pentateuch. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Gieseler (J. C. L., D.D.)—Compendium of Ecclesiastical History. Four Vols. (42s.)

Godet (F., D.D.)—Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel. Two Vols. (21s.)

—— **Commentary on St. John's Gospel.** Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)

—— **Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.** Two Vols. (21s.)

Goebel on the Parables. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Hagenbach (K. R., D.D.)—History of the Reformation. Two Vols. (21s.)

—— **History of Christian Doctrines.** Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)

Harless (G. C. A. von, D.D.)—A System of Christian Ethics. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Haupt (E.)—Commentary on the First Epistle of St. John. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Hävernick (Professor).—General Introduction to the Old Testament. One Vol. (10s 6d.)

Hengstenberg (E. W., D.D.)—Christology of the Old Testament, and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions. Four Vols. (42s.)

—— **Commentary on the Psalms.** Three Vols. (33s.)

—— **On the Book of Ecclesiastes.** To which are appended: Treatises on the Song of Solomon; the Book of Job; the Prophet Isaiah; the Sacrifices of Holy Scripture; and on the Jews and the Christian Church. One Vol. (9s.)

—— **Commentary on the Gospel of St. John.** Two Vols. (21s.)

—— **Commentary on Ezekiel.** One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

—— **Dissertations on the Genuineness of Daniel, etc.** One Vol. (12s.)

—— **The Kingdom of God under the Old Covenant.** Two Vols. (21s.)

[Continued on next page.

CLARK'S FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY—*Continued.*

Keil (C. F., D.D.)—Introduction to the Old Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— **Commentary on the Pentateuch.** Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
——— **Commentary on Joshua, Judges, and Ruth.** One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— **Commentary on the Books of Samuel.** One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— **Commentary on the Books of Kings.** One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— **Commentary on the Books of Chronicles.** One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— **Commentary on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther.** One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— **Commentary on Jeremiah and Lamentations.** Two Vols. (21s.)
——— **Commentary on Ezekiel.** Two Vols. (21s.)
——— **Commentary on the Book of Daniel.** One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— **Commentary on the Minor Prophets.** Two Vols. (21s.)
Kurtz (J. H., D.D.)—History of the Old Covenant; or, Old Testament Dispensation. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Lange (J. P., D.D.)—Commentary on the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
——— **Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke.** Two Vols. (18s.)
——— **Commentary on the Gospel of St. John.** Two Vols. (21s.)
Luthardt (C. E., D.D.)—Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Macdonald (D., M.A.)—Introduction to the Pentateuch. Two Vols. (21s.)
Martensen (Bishop)—Christian Dogmatics. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— **Christian Ethics. General—Social—Individual.** Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Müller (Dr. Julius)—The Christian Doctrine of Sin. Two Vols. (21s.)
Murphy (Professor)—Commentary on the Psalms. *To count as Two Volumes.* One Vol. (12s.)
Neander (A., D.D.)—General History of the Christian Religion and Church. Nine Vols. (67s. 6d.)
Oehler (Professor)—Biblical Theology of the Old Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
Olshausen (H., D.D.)—Commentary on the Gospels and Acts. Four Vols. (42s.)
——— **Commentary on Epistle to the Romans.** One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— **Commentary on Epistles to the Corinthians.** One Vol. (9s.)
——— **Commentary on Philippians, Titus, and 1st Timothy.** One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Philippi (F. A., D.D.)—Commentary on Epistle to Romans. Two Vols. (21s.)
Ritter (Carl)—Comparative Geography of Palestine. Four Vols. (26s.)
Schmid (C. F., D.D.)—New Testament Theology. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Shedd (W. G. T., D.D.)—History of Christian Doctrine. Two Vols. (21s.)
Steinmeyer (F. L., D.D.)—History of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— **The Miracles of our Lord in relation to Modern Criticism.** One Vol. (7s. 6d.)
Stier (Rudolf, D.D.)—The Words of the Lord Jesus. Eight Vols. (84s.)
——— **The Words of the Risen Saviour, and Commentary on the Epistle of St. James.** One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
——— **The Words of the Apostles Expounded.** One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Tholuck (A., D.D.)—Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. One Vol. (9s.)
Ullmann (C., D.D.)—Reformers before the Reformation, principally in Germany and the Netherlands. Two Vols. (21s.)
Weiss (B., D.D.)—Biblical Theology of the New Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
——— **The Life of Christ.** Vols. I. and II. (10s. 6d. each.)
Winer (G. B., D.D.)—Collection of the Confessions of Christendom. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

The Series forms an *Apparatus* without which it may be truly said *no Theological Library can be complete;* and the Publishers take the liberty of suggesting that no more appropriate gift could be presented to a Clergyman than the Series in whole or in part.

Subscribers' Names received by all Retail Booksellers.

LONDON: (*For Works at Non-subscription price only*) HAMILTON, ADAMS & Co.